# COLLECTION

OF

# BRITISH AUTHORS

TAUCHNITZ EDITION.

VOL. 2618.

FRENCH AND ENGLISH BY PHILIP G. HAMERTON.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.



TAUCHNITZ EDITION.

By the same Author,

MARMORNE . . . . . 1 vol.

# FRENCH AND ENGLISH

## A COMPARISON

BY

PHILIP GILBERT HAMERTON,
AUTHOR OF "THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE," "MARMORNE,"
ETC. ETC.

*COPYRIGHT EDITION.*

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LEIPZIG
BERNHARD TAUCHNITZ
1889.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

In the years 1886 and 1887 the author contributed a series of seven articles to the *Atlantic Monthly,* which bore the title of the present volume, and are in great part absorbed in it. The book, however, is essentially new, as it contains much more matter than the articles, and the chapters are either hitherto unpublished or rewritten in a less desultory order.

This work is not intended to be historical. It only professes to compare the French and English of the second half of the nineteenth century.

# PREFACE

## TO THE TAUCHNITZ EDITION.

THE kind of success most gratifying to me after writing a book of this kind would be to convert some readers to my own method, or rule, in the formation of opinion whether it concerns one side or the other. This method may be divided into two parts of which the first is to consider what facts I am able to ascertain by referring always to cases brought under my own observation and the second is never to go beyond my facts. The first half of this method requires, in the study of "French and English" a personal knowledge of the two countries and their languages, and the second requires mainly a certain habit, or disposition, which enables an author to resist the very strong temptation to go rather further than he ought. Now, with regard to personal knowledge, a writer in the *Saturday Review* has maintained that by the possession of what he calls "the historic sense," which is rather a vague expression, a man personally little acquainted with

a foreign country may have a knowledge of it equivalent or even superior to that acquired by long residence and personal study and observation. I do not believe that any English writer whatever would admit so much as this in the case of a Frenchman writing about England after some study of historical literature without any personal acquaintance with English people and things. I do not believe that any English critic would admit that a Frenchman who only knew England from written histories, mostly by foreign authors, had a full or accurate knowledge of the England of to-day. And, with regard to the "historic sense," I may observe that the present and recent past belong as much to history as the remote past, and that to have lived in France, as I myself have lived in that country, during the most momentous quarter of a century that she has gone through in modern times, is to have got possession of a key to her remoter past which, without residence, could be acquired only by men of the most exceptional endowments. Even in the matter of language alone, I am aware that every educated Englishman imagines that he knows French, but his French can never be vitalized without a long residence in France or without a thousand associations that are wanting to it so long as he remains out of the country and severed from its social and domestic life. It is in this, and not in mere antiquity, that consists the difference between a dead and a living language. The language in which you have expressed the deepest feelings of your nature, at those times in which all affectation is set aside,

is a living language for you, and all other tongues, whether contemporary or not, are your dead languages.

Now, with regard to the other point, that of *not going beyond one's facts* I cannot properly convey an idea of its importance without an example, and an example of the kind that I am always most scrupulously anxious to avoid. In the month of June 1889, when the first edition of this volume was already in type, an article by Mr. Stead appeared in the *Contemporary Review* and in that article he touched upon what is called in France the *laïcisation des hôpitaux*. The following is an extract.

"A great profession — in France there are 150,000 Sisters whose lives are devoted to 'the service of God's poor'—has been practically transferred from women of good life to women who regarded purity of life as an exploded superstition..... The horrible thing that was done by the removal of the Sisters was that a great profession, by which the women of France had earned an honourable livelihood, was transferred *en bloc*, by a single stroke, from the region of the morality of the cloister to that of the *coulisses* of the opera."

This "horrible thing" is attributed to the Government of the Republic. "In this latter day the Republic, having no more important enemies to deal with, banished them, for the avowed reason that *religieuses*, to whom time was but the ante-chamber of eternity, could not be entrusted with the care of the dying without abusing their position for purposes

of proselytism. Those who regarded the patient as a being whose existence terminated at death could not tolerate the presence in the hospital of those who regarded the death-bed as the threshold of another world. Therefore the decree went forth that the nursing of the sick poor must be entrusted to lay nurses. The nuns were driven out, and Sairey Gamp was installed in their place."

Here Mr. Stead has written according to the common method, and now let me apply that peculiar and unfashionable method which I believe to be in some respects superior. As usual, I begin by looking around me and find that no Sister has been expelled from the hospital in the nearest city. Its chaplain is a friend of mine, and he has not been dismissed either, at least he invited me to *déjeuner* very recently and did not mention it. I know some authorities at the college, an institution belonging to the Government, the Sisters are still in the infirmary and the chaplain (a friend of mine) continues his administration. Just now I am writing in Paris in the house of a professor who tells me that neither nuns nor Chaplain have been expelled from the infirmary in his *lycée*. Last week I dined in another *lycée* and was told that the Sisters and the Chaplain had never been disturbed. I ask a bishop about his diocese and he tells me that the expulsion of the Sisters from the hospitals is so rare in the provinces that it has not even occurred at Lyons, that it has occurred only in one instance in his own diocese and is not to be considered as an act of the Government but of hospital boards. In Paris I am told that the

expulsion of the Sisters from *Parisian* hospitals (not French hospitals generally) is due to the Board of Public Succour (*Assistance Publique*) and that the ultimate responsibility for permitting it belongs to the Municipal Council which has powers over the hospitals independently of the Government. All my informants are agreed on the point that a patient may call for a priest whenever he likes, the bishop only observed that he might possibly be too far gone to do so. Finally, in all conversations with moderate Republicans (the Government party) I have found them more or less disinclined to the expulsion of the Sisters from the hospitals, in Paris or elsewhere, and the organ of their party, the *Temps*, has consistently fought against the Municipal Council on this question of *laïcisation* from the beginning.

Another important point made by Mr. Stead is that "in France the career of the woman without fortune who is neither married nor *religieuse* is practically assumed to be that of the courtesan." Here, again, I have recourse to my old simple method of looking around me and see plenty of women who are neither married, nor *religieuses*, nor harlots, but who earn an honest livelihood as governesses, teachers, or domestic servants, exactly as they do in England.

My method, as the reader sees, is a good one for getting at the truth, but not so good for eloquence as the hastier methods of journalism. I admit that Mr. Stead's hundred and fifty thousand cruelly treated virgins, deprived of their daily bread, are an irresistible army of martyrs, and that it was a

masterly stroke of journalistic invention to array them against the Republic.

The parallel case about the removal of the crosses from the cemeteries is examined in the chapter on "Truth." In that instance a very small and unimportant decision of the Parisian Municipal Council, intended merely as an affirmation of religious equality, was magnified into an atrocious outrage on the part of the Republican Government against the consciences of all living Christians throughout France and the memory of millions of the dead.

Inventions of this kind are not evidence, and the opinions founded upon them are worth nothing. Such inventions only mislead and misinform, and I would ask the reader, where is the benefit of being misled and misinformed? Is it not better to keep cool and try to learn how things are in reality, rather than dissipate one's nervous energy in vain indignation about unsubstantial spectres and shadows?

It is not usually my custom to answer reviews, but a reference to them may occasionally clear up some part of a subject. A very good criticism on some points appeared in the *Athenæum* for June 22nd 1889 in which the writer indicated several omissions and a few errors. He said that I had spoken of cricket and boating as the principal physical trainers of English youth, but that, comparatively speaking, I had neglected cycling and football, and then he went on to observe that this was old-fashioned observation because many more English youths now

practise cycling and football than the other two exercises. I had, however, quite intended to give its due place to cycling, though in few words, and the more naturally that I am very fond of it myself. The writer then went on to blame me, justly, for not having attached due importance to running and lawn-tennis, now more practised in England than either cricket or rowing. My critic was less within his rights when he considered it a proof of ignorance in me to estimate fencing as probably the finest exercise known, an opinion which may be held without disparagement or forgetfulness of other exercises. He was right, on the other hand, in finding fault with me for a too favourable relative estimate of French rowing. "France," he says, "has never sent a crew to England which was worth looking at; but those English judges who have seen, and still more those who have timed, French crews, such as those of the three best rowing clubs of France—the Paris rowing Club, the Marne Club, and the *Cercle de l'Aviron* —know that no one of these three could hope to be anything but last in a heat for 'the Grand Challenge' at Henley; while if a representative French crew were made up out of all the clubs and properly trained, such a picked crew would be unable to hold its own not only with a picked crew for England, but with a single English club, such, for instance, as 'Thames,' and for the Henley course with even the single school of Eton." This is good and fair criticism, and the proof that the writer was not animated by any narrow hostility to France is that he thought I had under-estimated the physical

stature of the French race. "Mr. Hamerton knows France very well, but we must take exception to his statement that owing to the small stature of the French, 'it would be possible to form one French regiment of very fine men, but I doubt if there are enough for two regiments.' If Mr. Hamerton is speaking of men of towering height, his statement is true of all countries, as he will find if he inquires the standard of inches at which we have to enlist our Guards. But if he uses the phrase 'fine men' in a wider and truer sense, we would point to the whole of the *Garde Républicaine,* and the whole of the French *gendarmerie* as composed of very fine men." What I said about two regiments was in fact simply hyperbolic; there are a good many fine men in France but few in the ordinary line regiments, precisely because they get absorbed into the picked regiments and the *gendarmerie.* The average Englishman feels himself easily superior to the ordinary French population, but in every French parish he would meet with exceptional specimens of humanity who are both bigger and stronger than himself.

The writer in the *Athenæum* considers it an omission on my part not to have written about British snobbishness. "Surely," he says, "Mr. Hamerton ought to have given us a chapter upon that most distinctive British shortcoming." If I had done so, the critics would all have been down upon me for repeating commonplaces, the favourite accusation in an age eager after novelty. There are tasks in literature which have been accomplished so perfectly that there is no need to recur to them. It was

Thackeray's task to describe snobbishness and he performed it with such skill, that writers who come after him may wisely refrain from it. As an observer of French character I may be within my province in saying that there is remarkably little snobbishness in France, but that, too, is almost a commonplace. The same writer in the *Athenæum* thinks I have a strong feeling against the Roman Catholic religion. No, I have a hearty admiration for its effectual power of sustaining men and women in lives of sacrifice and work, and also a strong æsthetic sympathy with its dignified and impressive ritual. I believe, too, that the Church of Rome exercises in a remarkable degree the consoling power of religion, but in political and intellectual matters my sympathy is with the men who decline to be ruled by her.

A long and kind article by Mr. John Robertson in the *Scottish Leader* expressed so much regret about a paragraph in the first Preface that I have removed it. That paragraph stated as an opinion that there would never be any firm friendship between England and France, but that mutual consideration might be looked forward to. Mr. Robertson is more hopeful. "It is loose reasoning," he remarked, "to say that there will never be firm friendship between two nations while expressing a belief that they will develop a habit of mutual consideration which is of the very essence of firm friendship. It is rash to set bounds to the progress of peaceful civilisation." Certainly I have no desire to set any such bounds, but should be delighted to believe that

"French and English" will be as kind to each other, nationally, in the future as they are already individually.

The *Saturday Review* replied to my statement of the poor position of literature amongst the French upper classes by giving the names of several French noblemen who are known in literature. That is not to the point, as I was referring to the *professional* pursuit of letters. Any small country squire would consider himself, and be considered by everybody in his neighbourhood, as a much greater personage than a professional author. That is what I intended to convey. I meant that the squire would consider idleness more dignified than professional literary work. The Duke of Aumale is an author, but he would describe himself as a soldier by profession. *Apropos* of authors, the *Saturday Review*, in its article on this book, made a curiously inappropriate comparison of the writings of Rabelais to a Venus by Titian. The work of Rabelais is filthy and witty and wise and has not beauty for its object, being monstrously grotesque, whilst that of Titian is neither filthy nor witty, but richly beautiful without the faintest perceptible tendency to the grotesque. The same writer, who is proud of his knowledge of French, says he has read every word of Rabelais and almost every word of Zola. It is a pity that foreigners who learn French should so often go straight to the foulest literature they can find.

The writer in the *Saturday Review* endeavoured to justify its untrue statement that the whole of the Orleans family had been sent into exile by compar-

ing all the relations of the Count of Paris to his portmanteaus. They were, however, so little attached to his person that they travelled about quite independently of him and for my part, though not an adorer of rank, I do see a difference between a prince and a portmanteau.

Several reviewers seem to have derived rather an exaggerated idea from what I said about French intemperance. The careful reader will perceive that French temperance is equally recognised in this volume, but that it is not described as being universally prevalent. Much of French intemperance may be traced (in strange opposition to that of the north) to the lack of hospitality in France, especially towards young men. This drives them into the *cafés* for the sake of a little necessary human intercourse, and there the habit of moderate drinking is soon formed. Afterwards, in many instances, it passes the bounds of moderation. Visible drunkenness is excessively rare, except amongst the lowest classes. Amongst the working men the custom of treating prevails much more in Paris than in the provinces, and that is particularly harmful because when half-a-dozen people meet together each of them treats the other five, thereby making six glasses apiece. The most insidious form of French drinking is that which provides a varied succession of stimulants, in methodical order, with not very long intervals, an arrangement quite as regular as that of prayers in a monastic establishment. It is, in short, a systematic organisation of Bacchus worship, combining the most faithful observances with a decent

external prudence. There is something extremely French in this, for of all peoples the French are the most ingenious in making programmes of successive pleasures, to come each in its due time.

# PREFACE.

It may be taken as typical of the author's intentions that he has felt uncertain which of the two nationalities he would put first in the title, and that the question has been decided by a mere consideration of euphony. If the reader cares to try the experiment of saying "English and French," and "French and English" afterwards, he will find that the latter glides the more glibly from the tongue. There is a tonic accent at the beginning of the word "English" and a dying away at the end of it which are very convenient in the last word of a title. "French," on the other hand, comes to a dead stop, in a manner too abrupt to be agreeable.

The supercilious critic will say that I am making over-much of a small matter, but he may allow me to explain why I put the Frenchmen first, lest I be accused of a lack of patriotism. This book has not, however, been written from a patriotic point of view; it is not simply an exposition of the follies and sins of another nation for the comparative glorification of

my own, neither is it an example of what Herbert Spencer has aptly called "anti-patriotism," which is the systematic setting down of one's own countrymen by a comparison with the superior qualities of the foreigner.

I should like to write with complete impartiality, if it were possible. I have at least written with the most sincere desire to be impartial, and that perhaps at the cost of some popularity in England, for certain English critics have told me that impartiality is not patriotic, and others have informed me of what I did not know before, namely, that I prefer the French to my own countrymen.

It seems to me that the best patriotism does not consist in speaking evil of another country, but in endeavouring to serve one's own. There are many kinds of service. That of a writer is above all things to tell the truth and not to deceive his countrymen even when they wish to be deceived. If he fails in veracity he is guilty of a kind of treachery to his own country by giving it erroneous ideas or fallacious information. Such treachery may become serious when the subject of the volume is international. When public writers are patriotic in the old narrow and perverse meaning of the term, that is to say, when they are full of gall and injustice, when they systematically treat the foreigner as a being who has neither rights, nor merits, nor feelings, then, whether intentionally or not, they are urging their own nation on the path that leads to war. When they endeavour to write truly and justly about the foreigner, with a due consideration for his different position and a fair

recognition of his rights and feelings, then they are favouring the growth of a conciliatory temper which, when a difficulty arises, will tend to mutual concession and to the preservation of peace. Is it better or worse for England that she should maintain peaceful relations with her nearest neighbour, with that nation which, along with herself, has done most for liberty and light? That question may be answered by the experience of seventy years.

Whatever the spirit of justice may lead to in the correspondence of statesmen, it is a sad hindrance to effect in literature. I am fully aware of this, and know that, without justice, a more dashing and brilliant book might easily have been written. *Just* writing does not amuse, but malevolence may be made extremely entertaining. What is less obvious is that justice often puts her veto on those fine effects of simulated indignation which the literary advocate knows to be of such great professional utility. It is a fine thing to have an opportunity for condemning a whole nation in one terribly comprehensive sentence. The literary moralist puts on his most dignified manner when he can deplore the wickedness of thirty millions of human beings. It is ennobling to feel yourself better and greater than thirty millions, and the reader, too, has a fine sense of superiority in being encouraged to look down upon such a multitude. Justice comes in and says, "But there are exceptions and they ought not to be passed over." "That may be," replies the Genius of Brilliant Literature, "but if I stop to consider these I shall lose all breadth of effect. Lights will creep into my

black shadows and I shall no longer appal with gloom. I want the most telling oppositions. The interests of art take precedence over commonplace veracity."

The foreigner may be effectually dealt with in one of two ways. He may be made to appear either ridiculous or wicked. The satire may be humorous, or it may be bitter and severe. The French, with their lighter temperament, take pleasure in making the Englishmen absurd. The English, on their part, though by no means refusing themselves the satisfaction of laughing at their neighbours, are not disinclined to assume a loftier tone. It is not so much what is obviously ridiculous in French people that repels as that which cannot be described without a graver reprobation.

And yet, delightful as may be the pleasures of malice and uncharitableness, they must always be alloyed by the secret misgiving that the foreigner may possibly, in reality, not be quite so faulty as we describe him and as we wish him to be. But the pleasure of knowing the truth for its own sake, when there is no malice, is a satisfaction without any other alloy than the regret that men should be no better than they are.

One of my objects in this book has been to show real resemblances under an appearance of diversity. Not only do nations deceive themselves by names, but they seem anxious to deceive themselves and unwilling to be undeceived. For example, in the matter of Government, there is the deceptive use of the words "Monarchy" and "Republic." When we

are told, for the sake of contrast, that England is a Monarchy and France a Republic, it is impossible, of course, to deny that the statement is nominally accurate, but it conveys, and is disingenuously intended to convey, an idea of opposition that does not correspond with the reality. The truth is that both countries have essentially the same system of Government. In both we find a predominant Legislative Chamber, with a Cabinet responsible to that Chamber, and existing by no other tenure than the support of a precarious majority. The Chamber in both countries is elected by the people, with this difference, that in France the suffrage is universal and in England very nearly universal. In short, the degree of difference that there is does not justify the use of terms which would be accurate if applied to countries so politically opposite as Russia and the United States. Again, in the matter of religion, to say that France is "Catholic" and England "Protestant" conveys a far stronger idea of difference than that which would answer to the true state of the case. In each country we find a dominant Orthodoxy, the Church of the aristocracy, with its hierarchy of prelates and other dignitaries; and under the shadow of the Orthodoxy, like little trees under a big one, we find minor Protestant sects that have no prelates, and also tolerated Jews and unbelievers. Stated in this way the real similarity of the two cases becomes much more apparent, the most important difference (usually passed over in silence) being that co-establishment exists in France

for two Protestant sects and for the Jews, whilst it does not exist in England.

It is an obstacle to accurate thinking when differences are made to appear greater than they are by the use of misleading language.* France and England are, no doubt, very different, as two entirely independent nations are sure to be, especially when there is a marked diversity of race, but the distance between them is perpetually varying. I hope to show in this volume how they approach to and recede from each other. The present tendency is strongly towards likeness, as, for example, in the adoption by the English of the closure and county councils, which are both French institutions; and it might safely be predicted that the French and English peoples will be more like each other in the future than they are now. Democracy in politics and

* Here is an instance of misleading by mistranslation. The English newspapers speak of Parisian "Communists" when they ought to say Communards. A Communist is a Socialist of a particular kind, who wants to have goods in common after the fashion of the early Christians. A Communard is a person who wishes for an extreme development of local government reducing the State to a federation of self-governing Communes. M. Charles Beslay, an old friend of mine, became a Communard and was Governor of the Bank of France under the Commune. He was a most upright and honourable gentleman, and so far from being a Communist that he defended the treasure of the Bank of France throughout the civil war of 1871, and afterwards handed it over intact to the proper authorities. I do not accuse English journalists of intentional dishonesty in this case; there is no English equivalent for *Communard*, the nearest English rendering would be *township home-ruler*.

the recognition of complete liberty of conscience, both positive and negative, in religion, will be common to both countries. Even in matters of custom there is a perceptible approach, not to identity, but to a nearer degree of similarity. The chauvinist spirit in both countries recognises this unwillingly. A nobler patriotism may see in it some ground of hope for a better international understanding.

As it is unpleasant for an author to see his opinions misrepresented, I may be permitted to say that in politics I am a pure "Opportunist," believing that the best Government is that which is best suited to the *present* condition of a nation, though another might be ideally superior. When a country is left to itself a natural law produces the sort of Government which answers for the time. I look upon all Governments whatever as merely temporary and provisional expedients, usually of an unsatisfactory character, their very imperfection being a sort of quality, as it reconciles men to the inevitable change. To make a comparison far more sublime than our poorly-contrived political systems deserve, they are moving like the sun with all his *cortége* of planets towards a goal that is utterly unknown. Or it is possible that there may be no goal whatever before us, but only unending motion. The experimental temper of our own age is preparing, almost unconsciously, for an unseen and unimaginable future. It is our vain desire to penetrate the secret of that future that makes all our experiments so interesting to us. France has been the great experimental laboratory during the last hundred years, but England is now almost

equally venturesome, and is likely, before long, to become the more interesting nation of the two.

I believe Parliamentary Government to be the only system possible and practicable in England and France at the present day. I believe this without illusion and without enthusiasm. The parliamentary system is so imperfect that it works slowly and clumsily in England, whilst in France it can hardly be made to work at all. With two parties the prize of succession is offered to the most eloquent fault-finder, with three a Cabinet has not vitality enough for bare existence. At the present moment the English Parliament inspires but little respect and the French no respect whatever. Still we are parliamentarians, not for the love of long speeches in the House, but from a desire to preserve popular liberty outside of it. The distinction here between England and France is that in France every parliamentarian is of necessity a republican, a freely-elected parliament being incompatible with monarchy in that country, whereas in England Queen Victoria, unlike her predecessor Charles I., has made it possible for her subjects to be parliamentarians and royalists at the same time.

In the variety of national and religious antipathies we sometimes meet with strange anomalies. Whenever there is any conflict between French Catholics and French Freethinkers the sympathy of all but a very few English people is assured to the Catholics beforehand, without any examination into the merits of the case, and the case itself is likely to be stated in England in such a manner as to command sym-

pathy for the Catholics. This is remarkable in a country which is, on the whole, Protestant, as the very existence of the French Protestants (in themselves a defenceless minority) is due to the protection of the Freethinkers. Without that strictly neutral protection Protestant worship would no more be tolerated in France than it was in the city of Rome when the Popes had authority there. On the other hand, if Freethinkers, such as the present generation of French politicians, were masters of England, the worst evil to be apprehended would be the impartial treatment of all religions, either by co-establishment as in France, or by disestablishment as in Ireland. The bishops might be dismissed from the House of Lords, but the bishops and clergy of all faiths would be eligible for the House of Commons, as they are for the Chamber of Deputies.

It is now quite a commonly-received opinion in England that religion is "odiously and senselessly persecuted" in France, but nothing is said against the Italian Government for its treatment of the monastic orders. Neither does it occur to English writers that this is a case of a mote in the neighbour's eye and a beam in one's own. The Catholic Church has been robbed and pillaged by the French secular power, which allows her nearly two millions sterling a year in compensation, and keeps the diocesan edifices in excellent repair. The Catholic Church has been robbed and pillaged by the English secular power, which repairs none of her buildings and allows her nothing a year in compensation. In France the Jewish and Dissenting clergy are paid

by the "persecuting" State, in England they get nothing from the State. Catholic street processions are forbidden in many of the French towns; in England they are tolerated in none. In France a Catholic may be the head of the State; in England he is excluded from that position by law. The French Government maintains friendly diplomatic relations with the Holy See; a Nuncio is not received at the Court of St. James's.

The French Government is described as persecuting and tyrannical because it has sent pretenders into exile after tolerating them for sixteen years. The English Government never tolerated pretenders at all, but kept them in exile from first to last—the *last* being their final extinction on foreign soil.

Another very curious and unfortunate anomaly is the instinctive opposition of French Republicans to England. It exists in degrees exactly proportioned to the degree of democratic passion in the Frenchman. When he is a moderate Republican he dislikes England moderately, a strong Republican usually hates her, and a radical Republican detests her. These feelings are quite outside of the domain of reason. England is nominally monarchical, it is true, but in reality, as every intelligent Frenchman ought to know, she has set the example of free institutions.

An hypothesis that may explain such anomalies as these, is that the ancient national antipathy which our fathers expressed in bloodshed has now, in each nation, taken the form of jealousy of the other's progress, so that although each enjoys freedom for herself she can never quite approve of it in her neigh-

bour. There is also the well-known dislike to neutrals which in times of bitter contention intensifies itself into a hatred even stronger than the hatred of the enemy. The French Freethinker is a neutral between hostile religions, and the English lover of political liberty is regarded as a sort of neutral by Frenchmen, since he has neither the virulence of the *intransigeant* nor the vindictiveness of the *réactionnaire.*

In concluding this Preface I wish to say a few words about nationality in ideas.

The *purity* of nationality in a man's ideas is only compatible with pure ignorance. An English agricultural labourer may be purely English. The gentleman's son who learns Latin and Greek becomes partly latinised and partly hellenised; if he learns to speak French at all well he becomes, so far, gallicised. To preserve the pure English quality you must exclude everything that is not English from education. You must exclude even the natural sciences and the fine arts, as they have been built up with the aid of foreigners and constantly lead to the study of foreign works. These things do not belong to a nation but to the civilised world, and England, as Rebecca said in *Ivanhoe,* is not the world. Her men of science quote foreign authorities continually, her painters and musicians are nourished, from their earliest youth, on continental genius.

But although it is impossible for an educated man to preserve the *purity* of his mental nationality, that is, its exclusive and insular character, although it is impossible for him to dwell in English ideas

only when foreign ideas are equally accessible to him, the fact remains that the educated mind still includes far more of what is English than the uneducated one. The man who is called "half a foreigner" because he knows a foreign language may be more largely English than his critic. A rich man may hold foreign securities and yet, at the same time, have larger English investments than his poorer neighbour. Even with regard to affection, there are Englishmen who love Italy far more passionately than I have ever loved France, yet they love England as if they had never quitted their native parish.

# CONTENTS

## OF VOLUME I.

PART IV.—RELIGION.



PART V.—VIRTUES.

# PART I.

## EDUCATION.

## CHAPTER I.

### PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

In England there is not much physical education of a formal and methodical nature; the English are not remarkable for a love of gymnastic exercises, and they seldom train or develop the body scientifically except when they prepare themselves for boat races or boxing. In saying this I leave out of consideration the small class of professional athletes, which is not numerous enough to affect the nation generally. It has been said, and by a French author, that of all modern races the English come nearest, in the physical life, to the existence of the ancient Greeks. The difference, however, between the modern English and the Greeks of classic antiquity is mainly in this, that the Greeks were a systematically trained people and the English are not.

Not much formal Physical Training in England.

English and Greeks.

Still, the English are a remarkably active people, and they owe their activity chiefly to a love of rural amusements and of the open air. Thus, in an informal manner, they get a kind of unscientific training which is of immense advantage to their health and vigour. According to scientific opinion, more

Activity of the English.

might be made of the English people if they took as much interest in gymnastic training as they do in their active amusements. The advantage of these amusements is that they divert the mind, and so in turn have a healthy influence on the body, independently of muscular exertion.

Advantage of Amusements.

There are exceptions to the usual English indifference about gymnastics, and it may happen that the lover of gymnastics cares less than others for the usual English sports. This was the case with Professor Clifford. His biographer says: "At school he showed little taste for the ordinary games, but made himself proficient in gymnastics; a pursuit which at Cambridge he carried out, in fellowship with a few like-minded companions,* not only into the performance of the most difficult feats habitual to the gymnasium, but into the invention of other new and adventurous ones. His accomplishments of this kind were the only ones in which he ever manifested pride."

Professor Clifford.

Many distinguished Englishmen have had some favourite physical amusement that we associate with their names. It is almost a part of an Englishman's nature to select a physical pursuit and make it especially his own. His countrymen like him the better for having a taste of this kind. Mr. Gladstone's practised skill in tree-felling is a help to his popularity. The readers of Wordsworth, Scott, and Byron, all remember that the first was a pedestrian, the second a keen sportsman, and the third the best swimmer of his time. The readers of Keats are

Choice of Physical Pursuits.

Gladstone.

Wordsworth. Scott. Byron.

Keats.

* Observe that the like-minded companions were "few."

sorry for the ill-health that spoiled the latter years of his short life, but they remember with satisfaction that the ethereal poet was once muscular enough to administer "a severe drubbing to a butcher whom he caught beating a little boy, to the enthusiastic admiration of a crowd of bystanders." Shelley's name is associated for ever with his love of boating and its disastrous ending. In our own day, when we learn something about the private life of our celebrated contemporaries, we have a satisfaction in knowing that they enjoy some physical recreation, as, for example, that Tyndall is a mountaineer, Millais a grouse-shooter, John Bright a salmon-fisher; and it is characteristic of the inveteracy of English physical habits that Mr. Fawcett should have gone on riding and skating after he was blind, and that Anthony Trollope was still passionately fond of fox-hunting when he was old and heavy and could hardly see. The English have such a respect for physical energy that they still remember with pleasure how Palmerston hunted in his old age, and how, almost to the last, he would go down to Epsom on horseback. There was a little difficulty about getting him into the saddle, but, once there, he was safe till the end of his journey.

Shelley. Tyndall. Millais. Bright. Trollope. Palmerston.

Cricket, boating and foot-ball are the trainers of English youth, and foreigners, when they visit the public schools, are astonished at the important place assigned to these two pursuits. It is always amusing to an Englishman to read the descriptions of the national game by which French writers attempt (of course without success) to make it intelligible to

Cricket, Boating and Foot-ball.

their countrymen. These descriptions are generally erroneous, occasionally correct, but invariably as much from the outside as if the writer were describing the gambols of strange animals. Whilst English and French have billiards and many other games in common, cricket remains exclusively and peculiarly English. It cannot be acclimatised in France. I believe that some feeble attempts have been made, but without result. The game could not be played in the gravelled courts of French *lycées*, under a hundred windows, but this difficulty would be overcome if there were any natural genius for cricket in the French race. A few of the *lycées* are in large towns, and far from possible cricket fields; the majority are in small towns, not a mile from pasture and meadow. The French seem to believe that all English youths delight in the national game, but that is a foreigner's generalisation. Some English boys dislike it, and play only to please others, or because it is the fashion amongst boys. However, most English boys have gone through the training of cricket, though many give it up when they abandon Latin. It is useful because it does not exercise the legs only, like walking and the velocipede, but all the body.

Cricket in France.

French *Lycées*.

The French would have had a tolerable equivalent for cricket if they had kept up their own fine national game of tennis. Unfortunately the costliness of tennis-courts has caused the abandonment of the game, and this is the more to be regretted that the French system of education in large public schools might have harmonised so conveniently with it. Field

Tennis.

tennis, the parent of modern English lawn tennis, might have been kept up in the country. The present French tendency in exercises is towards gymnastics and military drill. No one who has observed the two peoples closely can doubt that the French have more natural affinity for gymnastics than the English. This may be due in part to their less lively interest in physical amusements. Not being so ready to amuse themselves freely in active pastimes, they are more ready to accept gymnastics as a discipline.* As for military drill, it is more and more imposed upon the French by the military situation in Europe, so that they would practise it whether they liked it or not; still, it is certain that they have a natural liking and aptitude for military exercises. The authorities who have directed public education in France in the middle of the nineteenth century have treated physical exercise with such complete neglect that a reaction is now setting in. It may be doubted whether in any age or country the brain has been worked with such complete disregard of the body as in France from 1830 to 1870. An observer may see the consequences of that absurd education even now in the stiff elderly men who never knew what activity is, the men who cannot get into a boat quickly or safely, who never

French Affinity for Gymnastics.

Military Drill.

Consequences of Neglect.

* It is curious that the French gymnastic societies should be rather discouraged by the Church, as giving too much attention to the body. I have seen formal expressions of clerical disapprobation. There may be some other reason. Everything has a political colour in France, and I believe that the gymnastic societies, now very numerous, are mainly republican.

mounted a horse, and who take curious precautions in getting down from a carriage. The present generation is more active—the effects of gymnastics are beginning to tell. The comprehensive conscription, which imposes military exercises on almost every valid citizen, has also been, and will be still more in the future, a great bodily benefit to the French race. The maintenance of duelling in France, after its abandonment in England, gives the French a certain advantage in the habitual practice of fencing, which is learned seriously, as men only learn those things on which living or life may one day depend. I need not expatiate on the merits of fencing as an exercise. It increases both strength and grace, as it is at the same time extremely fatiguing and exacting with regard to posture and attitude. I am inclined to believe that fencing is the finest exercise known.

Military Exercises.

Duelling.

Pedestrianism.

In ordinary pedestrianism there is not much difference between the two countries except in the female sex, and there it is strongly marked. Englishwomen who have leisure walk perhaps three or four times as much as Frenchwomen in the same position. Young men in both countries may be equally good walkers if they have the advantage of rural life. The French peasants are slow pedestrians but remarkably enduring; they will go forty or fifty miles in the twenty-four hours, being out all night, and think nothing of it. Riding on horseback is much more practised in England; the economy of the carriage, by which one horse can transport several persons, and the excellent modern roads,

Englishwomen and Frenchwomen.

French Peasants.

Riding on Horseback.

had almost killed equestrianism in France, but now there are some signs of a revival. Here, too, the large national army has an excellent influence. Great numbers of Frenchmen learn to ride in the cavalry and artillery, and the captains of infantry are all mounted. There is not, in France, the most valuable training of all, that of riding to hounds in the English sense; and therefore it is probable that England could produce a far greater number of horsemen able to leap well. As for style in riding, that is a matter of taste, and national ideas differ. The French style is derived chiefly from military examples, the English indirectly from the hunting-field.

Cavalry and Artillery.

English Hunting.

False ideals of dignity are very inimical to effective bodily exercise. A foolish notion that it is more dignified to be seen in a carriage than on horseback, has deprived all French ecclesiastics of the use of the saddle. Their modes of locomotion are settled by a fixed rule; they may walk (generally with the breviary in their hands, which they read whilst walking), and the poor curé may now keep a small pony carriage. A bishop must always ride in a close carriage drawn by a pair of horses. A curé may drive himself; a bishop may not drive. In England these rules are not so strict, as the clergy are not so widely different from the laity. The English clergyman may ride on horseback and be active in other ways; still, there is a prejudice even in England against too much healthy activity in clergymen. Being on a visit to a vicar in the north of England, I found that he possessed a complete apparatus for archery. "That is a good thing for you," I said;

False Ideals of Dignity.

French Ecclesiastics.

Exercises permitted to English Clergymen.

but he looked melancholy, and answered, "It would be if my parishioners permitted the use of it, but they talked so much that I was forced to give up archery. They considered it unbecoming in a clergyman, who ought to be attending to his parish. Had I spent the same time over a decanter of port wine in my dining-room they would have raised no objection." The same clergyman was fond of leaping, but indulged that passion in secret, as if it had been a sin. Still, these prejudices are stronger in France. I never saw a French priest shoot, or hunt, or row in a boat. It cannot be the cruelty of shooting and hunting which prevents him, as he is allowed to fish with hooks; it is simply the activity of the manlier sports that excites disapprobation.

Cycling began first to be prevalent in France before 1870. After that it was taken up by the English who immensely improved the construction of machines, and cycling became very popular in England. This gave a new impulse to French cycling, which increased enormously between 1885 and 1889. At present there are cycling clubs in all the French towns, and as the roads in France are generally excellent the young men frequently make rather long excursions. The velocipede is doing more to overcome French sedentary habits than any other invention. The prejudice against it on the score of dignity is just beginning to give way. A few country squires are beginning to use it, as well as priests and physicians.

French Prejudice against Boating.

There was formerly an intense prejudice against boating in France. It was considered low, and even

immoral, being inextricably associated in the popular mind with excursions in the worst possible feminine society. Nobody in those days understood that sailing and rowing could both be refined and pure pleasures. The first book published on amateur boating in France appeared to authorise these prejudices by its own intense vulgarity. Since then boating has gained in dignity, and there are now regattas at most of the river-side towns, with beautifully constructed boats and perfectly respectable crews. The whole tone of the pursuit has changed; it has got rid of vulgar pleasantry, and has become scientific, an improvement greatly helped by the excellent scientific review *Le Yacht*. Many French boating men have been led by their pursuit to a thorough study of construction and nautical qualities. The only objection I have to make to French boating as it exists to-day, is that it seems too dependent on the stimulus of regattas, and carried on too exclusively with that object. The best lover of boating follows it for itself, as a lover of reading does not read only for a degree.

Present State of Boating in France.

Although the French have improved in rowing and still more in sailing, the taste for these pursuits is limited to comparatively few persons in France. If such a marvellously perfect river as the Saône existed in England it would swarm with pleasure craft of all kinds, but as it happens to be in France you may travel upon it all day without seeing one white sail. There are, however, three or four regatta clubs with excellent boats. I know one Frenchman who delights in possessing sailing vessels, but never

Taste for Boating limited in France.

French Regatta Clubs.

uses them, and I remember a yachtsman whose ship floated idly on the water from one regatta to another. Now and then you meet with the genuine nautical passion in all its strength, with the consequence that it is perfectly unintelligible to all wise and dignified citizens.

The Nautical Passion.

Swimming.

Swimming is much more cultivated and practised in France than in England. This is probably due in some degree to the hot French summers, which warm the water so thoroughly that one may remain in it a long time without chill. All along the Saône the boys learn swimming at a very early age. It is the boast of the village of St. Laurent, opposite Mâcon, that every male can swim. Ask one of the villagers if he is a swimmer, and he does not answer "Yes," but smiles significantly, and says, *"Je suis de St. Laurent."* Wherever a river provides a deep pool it is used as a swimming bath. In England the accomplishment is much more rare, and is usually confined to the middle and upper classes, especially in the rural districts. When we read in the newspaper that an English boat has capsized we always expect to find that most of the occupants were unable to swim and sank to rise no more. Amongst English sailors the art seems to be nearly unknown, and they have even a prejudice against it as tending to prolong the agonies of drowning. In the female sex, also, France takes the lead by the number of ladies who can swim a little, though they have not a Miss Beckwith amongst them, any more than Frenchmen can produce a Captain Webb. It is characteristic of England, with her vigorous race, to

Prevalence of Swimming in France.

Swimming in England.

Exceptional Excellence.

produce the finest and strongest swimmers, though her general average is so deplorably low. One English family may be long remembered, that of Vice-Chancellor Shadwell, who progressed grandly in the Thames, followed by his nine sons. Low Average.

Dancing used to be an essentially French exercise, and as it was much practised in the open air it was conducive to healthy activity. The best kind of dancing was that which used to bring together a few peasant families in the summer evenings. The reader observes that I am speaking of the past. In the present day dancing of that kind seems to be almost entirely abandoned. Unhealthy dancing in small crowded rooms is practised to some extent by the middle classes. As for the *bals publics*, the fewer of them there are the better. In obvious ways, and in ways that I can only hint at, they are injurious to the public health. Dancing.

In field sports the chief difference between France and England is not a difference of taste for sport itself, but a difference in game-preserving. In England this is carried to the utmost perfection by the most artificial means and at enormous cost; in France this is done only on a few estates, and ordinary game-preserving is very lax and very economical. Often it is merely nominal. Some man with another occupation is supposed to be the *garde*, and he walks over the estate occasionally with a gun, killing a hare or a partridge for his private use, and seldom arresting a poacher. Still, the shootings are supposed to be worth something, as they are let, though at low prices. The English believe that there Field Sports.

is no game at all in France, except a few partridges; and they might quote French humorists in support of this opinion, as they have laughed at the Parisian sportsman and his empty bags from time immemorial. However, as this is not a comic account, but an attempt to tell the truth, I may say that for several years my sons kept my larder very fairly supplied with game in the shooting season, including hares, partridges, woodcocks, snipes, and wild ducks. The neighbouring squires occasionally kill a deer or a wild boar, and one nobleman has killed many wild boars, some of them magnificent beasts.

Shooting in France.

Game not over-abundant.

As a rule, a French sportsman walks much for little game, and is himself quite aware that the game is a mere pretext; the exercise is the real object. If the English reader thinks this ridiculous, I may remind him that English fox-hunting is an application of the same principle. A hundred horsemen follow a single fox, and when he is killed they do not even eat him. A French friend of one of my sons was invited to shoot at Ferrières, on the preserves of Baron Rothschild, but he said he soon had enough of it, as the game was so abundant that the interest in the pursuit of it was entirely destroyed. He compared it, as an amusement, with the shooting of fowls in a poultry yard.

French Hunting.

There is nothing that resembles English hunting in France. French hunting is pretty and picturesque, with some remnant of old-world costume and ceremonial, and it affords some exercise in riding about the roads through the dense forests, but as a training in horsemanship it is not comparable to such

hunting as I have witnessed in Yorkshire. French farmers and peasant proprietors would never permit a regiment of gentlemen to spoil their fences; that can only be done in a very aristocratic country.

Contrast between Classes in regard to the Physical Life.

As to the physical life, both England and France present the same contrasts, but they are more striking in England. There you have an active and vigorous upper class much enjoying the open air, and a lower class in the big towns living without either pure air or healthy exercise. The physical quality of the race is well maintained, and even improved, at one end of the scale, and deteriorated at the other. Unfortunately the class which deteriorates, the lowest urban class, is not only the more numerous, but also reckless in reproduction, so that its power for degradation is greater than the aristocratic conservative or improving power. The ideal would be a whole nation physically equal to the English aristocracy. That aristocracy has undoubtedly set the example of healthy living, but the objection is that its fine health costs too much. With its immense apparatus of guns, yachts, and horses, its great army of servants, its extensive playgrounds, the aristocracy sets an example that cannot be followed by the poor man, shut up in the atmosphere of a factory all day and sleeping in an ill-drained street at night. The rich have another immense advantage in the free access to natural beauty, which is favourable to cheerfulness and therefore indirectly to health. The ancient Greeks, who led the perfect physical life, were surrounded by noble scenery, glorious in colour. Compare the foul sky and spoilt

The desirable Ideal.

Apparatus of the English Aristocracy.

Access to Natural Beauty.

landscape of Manchester with the purple hills, brilliant sunlight, wondrously clear atmosphere, and waters of intensest azure, that surrounded the City of the Violet Crown!

English and French Middle Classes.

Putting aside the aristocracies of both countries, which may live as healthily as they please, let us examine the state of the middle classes and the common people. The middle classes in both take insufficient out-door exercise, their occupations are too confining and too sedentary, they stiffen prematurely, and after that are fit for nothing but formal walks. Their physical life is lower than that of the aristocracy and lower than that of the agricultural population. The two greatest blessings in our time for the English of the middle class have been velocipedes and volunteering. France has one advantage over England in the numbers of the

Peasants.

peasant class, which leads a healthy and active life, though its activity is of a slow and plodding kind.

Factory Population.

The factory population, proportionally much larger in England, is more unfavourably situated. It undergoes wasting fatigue in bad overheated air, but it does not get real exercise; consequently, whilst the aristocracy keep up its strength, the factory population deteriorates.

Comparison of the two Races.

A comparison of English and French physical qualities leads to the following conclusions. The English are by nature incomparably the finer and handsomer race of the two; but their industrial system, and the increasing concentration in large towns, are rapidly diminishing their collective superiority, though it still remains strikingly visible in

the upper classes. The French are generally of small stature, so that a man of middle height in England is a tall man in France, and French soldiers in their summer fatigue blouses look to an Englishman like boys. Still, though the ordinary Frenchman is short, he is often muscular and capable of bearing great fatigue, as a good pony will. His shortness is mainly in the legs, yet he strides vigorously in marching. There are also many remarkable exceptions. You may generally find a tall and powerful man in a French village if you look for him. Such men composed Louis Napoleon's famous *Cent Gardes*, and are now distributed amongst various select regiments and absorbed in the ubiquitous *gendarmerie*.

The Physical Future of the English and French Races.

One cannot look to the physical future of either race without the gravest anxiety. Unless some means be found for arresting the decline caused by industrialism and the rapid using-up of life in large cities, it will ruin both races in course of time. Already the French physicians recognise a new type, sharp and sarcastic mentally, with visible physical inferiority, the special product of Paris. The general spread of a certain education is indisposing the French for that rural peasant life which was their source of national health, and the population of England is crowding into the large towns. There are two grounds of hope, and only two. The first is the modern scientific spirit, with its louder and louder warning against the neglect of the body; the second is the extension of military training, of which I shall have more to say in another chapter.

## CHAPTER II.

### INTELLECTUAL EDUCATION.

ENGLAND and France have been governed, since the Renaissance, by the same ideas about intellectual education, though there have been certain differences in the application of these ideas.

Latin and Greek.

Educators in both countries have persistently maintained the incomparable superiority of Latin and Greek over modern languages, not only for their linguistic merits, but also on the ground that the literature enshrined in them was infinitely superior to any modern literature whatever. French education insisted chiefly upon Latin. Frenchmen take "learning" to be equivalent to Latin. They call a man *instruit* when he has learned Latin, although he may have a very limited acquaintance with Greek, and they say that one *a fait des études incomplètes* when he has not taken his bachelor's degree, which implies that bachelors have made *des études complètes* though they know Greek very imperfectly.

Latin in France.

Greek in England.

In England Latin was considered necessary, but Greek was the great object of achievement. A "scholar," in England, means especially a Greek scholar. One may be a scholar without Hebrew or Arabic, but certainly not without Greek. The ordinary level of French attainment in Hellenic studies

appears contemptible to the English of the learned class.

The Principle common to both Countries.

However, the principle was the same in both countries, and may be expressed in terms applicable to both. That principle was the choice of an ancient language that could be taught authoritatively by the learned in each country. They can never teach a modern language in that authoritative way, as in modern languages their degree of accomplishment must always be inferior to that of the educated native. When the teacher assumes great dignity it is essential to its maintenance that he should be secure from this crushing rivalry, and this security can be given by an ancient language alone. Besides this professional consideration there is the effect of antiquity, and of a certain mystery, on the popular mind. So long as the people could be made to believe that a lofty and peculiar wisdom, not communicable in translations, was enshrined in Latin and Greek words, the learned were supposed to be in possession of mysterious intellectual advantages. There was even an hieratic quality in the dead languages. Closely connected with religion, they were the especial study of priests, and communicated by them to the highest classes of the laity. They belonged to the two most powerful castes, the sacerdotal and the aristocratic. Even yet the French village priest not only says mass in Latin, but makes quotations in Latin from the Vulgate when preaching to illiterate peasants. He appeals in this way to that reverence for, and awe of, mysterious words which belongs to the uncultured man. He knows,

Dignity of the Teacher.

Antiquity and Mystery.

Hieratic quality of the dead Languages.

Latin Quotations.

but does not tell his humble audience, that the Vulgate is itself a translation, and that, were it not for the effect of mystery, he might equally give the passage in French.

In the same way a knowledge, or even a supposed knowledge, of Latin gave laymen an ascendency over the lower classes and over women in their own rank. It was easy for a Frenchman who knew no English to declare to a French audience equally ignorant that the whole vast range of English literature was not worthy of comparison with what has come down to us from ancient Rome. He could class English authors in the two categories of barbarians who knew nothing of antiquity and imitators who feebly attempted to copy its inimitable masterpieces. The only education worthy of the name was that which he himself possessed, and those literatures that he did not know were simply not worth knowing.

French Contempt for Modern Literatures.

The intensely conventional nature of these beliefs, both in France and England, may be proved by their inconsistency. It was laid down as a principle that a knowledge of ancient books through translations was not knowledge, yet at the same time the clergy, with very few exceptions, were dependent on translations for all they knew of the Old Testament, and few French laymen had Greek enough even to read the Gospels. In either country you may pass for a learned man though destitute of any critical or historical knowledge of the literature of your native tongue. One may be a learned English-

Conventionalism.

Inconsistency.

Learning and Ignorance.

man without knowing Anglo-Saxon, or a learned Frenchman though ignorant of the *langue d'oil*.

Modern Tendencies.

The close of the nineteenth century is marked by two tendencies that seem opposed yet are strictly consistent, being both the consequence of an increased desire for reality in education. One is a tendency to much greater thoroughness in classical studies themselves, and the other a tendency, every day more marked, to abandon those studies when true success is either not desired, or in the nature of things unattainable. The greater thoroughness of modern study is sufficiently proved by the better quality of the books which help the learner, and the most remarkable point in the apparently contradictory condition of the modern mind is that the age which has perfected all the instruments for classical study is the first age since the Renaissance to propose seriously its general, though not universal, abandonment. M. Raoul Frary, himself a scholar, has been so impressed by the present imperfection and incompleteness of classical studies that he has seriously proposed the abolition of Latin as a compulsory study for boys. "Only one thing," he says, "could justify the crushing labour of beginning Latin, that would be the full possession and entire enjoyment of the ancient masterpieces, and that is precisely what is wanting to the crowd of students. They leave school too soon, and the later years are too much crowded with work to allow any time for reading." For the same reason, the uselessness of partly learned Latin as an instrument of culture, Professor Seeley wisely proposes to defer the com-

Thoroughness of Modern Study.

Proposed Abandonment of the Classics. Mr. Raoul Frary.

Professor Seeley's Proposal.

mencement of that study to the age of fourteen,* and spend the time so gained on English. Greek, I conclude, he would defer for two or three years longer. Not only M. Frary, but some other Frenchmen who appreciate Greek for themselves, would exclude it entirely from the *lycées*. "Amongst the young men," he says, "who come out of our colleges, not one in ten is able to read even an easy Greek author, not one in a hundred will take the trouble. We will not discuss the question whether our youth ought to cease to learn Greek. They do not learn it, the question is settled by the fact."

With my deference on these questions to those who are accustomed to teaching, I have submitted M. Frary's book (*La Question du Latin*) to two or three masters in *lycées,* and their answer to it is this. They say: "It is quite true that, considered as an acquisition, the Greek taught in *lycées* does not count, and though Latin is learned much better the pupils gain a very small acquaintance with Latin literature, and that chiefly by fragments; nevertheless, we do unquestionably find that, as gymnastics, these studies cannot be replaced by anything else that we know of. There are now pupils who do not study Latin or Greek, and we find that when they are brought into contact with the others *on other subjects* their intelligence seems undeveloped and inflexible. It is

Opinion of Masters in French *Lycées*.

Mental Gymnastics.

* "In that case," it may be objected, "boys who left school at fourteen would miss Latin altogether." Yes, it is Professor Seeley's desire that they should omit Latin, and those who left at sixteen would omit Greek. The time so gained would be devoted to real culture through English.

difficult, and often impossible, to make them understand things that are plain to the classical students."*

Here I leave this *Question du Latin*, regretting only that the quickened intelligence of classical students should fail to master their own particular study. The value of modern languages, as a discipline, cannot easily be ascertained, because they are rarely studied in that spirit. They have been systematically kept in a position of inferiority, by giving them insufficient time and by employing incompetent masters. They were established as a study in the French public schools by a royal ordinance, dated March 26, 1829, but M. Beljame** tells us that nothing was done to insure the competence of the teachers. These were picked up entirely by accident. "The masters of those days were generally political exiles, and even the best educated amongst them had never previously thought of teaching. When they were French no better

Modern Languages.

In French Public Schools.

Quality of the Teachers.

* Since the above paragraph was written I have consulted a very able *Professeur de Faculté* and Latin examiner on this *Question du Latin*. He says: "The young men who come up for examination have an imperfect knowledge of Latin, and the standard of attainments falls lower and lower. The remedy that I should propose would be to reduce to fifteen the number of *lycées* where Latin and Greek are taught. In those fifteen *lycées* I would maintain a really high standard of genuine scholarship. That would be sufficient for all the real scholars that the country wants, and then the teaching in the ordinary *lycées*, being relieved of false pretension about Latin and Greek, might itself become genuine in other ways."

** In an article in the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* for April 15, 1885. The article contains many interesting details.

qualifications were required. A member of the University told me that he had for teachers of English in the State schools, first, the town hatter, who had a business connection with England, then the cook from the best hotel, who had exercised his art on the other side the Channel. These gentlemen were good enough to give some of their leisure moments to the University. No examination was required, either from foreigners or Frenchmen. Foreigners were supposed to know their language; as for the others, some functionary, usually quite ignorant of every European tongue, put the question, 'Do you know German?' or, 'Do you know English?' The candidate answered 'Yes,' and received at once the necessary authorisation." Francisque Sarcey, in his *Souvenirs de Jeunesse*, tells us that in his time the hour nominally devoted to English was passed at leap-frog, that being the traditional way of spending it. Even at the *École Normale* the teaching of modern languages was entrusted to a pupil, and if no pupil happened to possess a knowledge of English or German some teacher was sought elsewhere.

A Hatter.

A Cook.

Examination.

Experience of F. Sarcey.

The *École Normale*.

State of Things in 1888.

These were the miserable beginnings. In the present year (1888) the study of modern languages is better established in France than in England. It is obligatory in secondary education. Teachers in the *lycées* are required to be either *bacheliers ès lettres* or to have a corresponding foreign degree, and it is hoped that before long the *licence ès lettres* (equivalent to the English mastership) will be exacted. They have to pass a special linguistic examination for a certificate before they can teach in the *lycées*.

Quality of Present Teachers.

This examination is a serious test, but it is much less severe than the competitive trial for the *agrégation*. The certificate gives the rank of a *licencié*, the *agrégation* that of a Fellow of the University. Every year the candidates are of a better class. M. Beljame says that he knows thirty teachers of English who were already *licenciés*, and amongst the candidates in 1884 twelve had already taken that degree. In short, the teachers of modern languages are now rapidly assuming the same position in the University as the classical masters; and it is only just that they should do so, since they have the same general culture, and their special examinations are more searching. For example, the candidate for the *agrégation* has to lecture twice, before the examiners at the Sorbonne and in public, once in English and once in French.

Improvement in the Class of Teachers in France.

In England the teachers of modern languages pass no examinations and have no dignity. They are often required to render services outside of their special work. They are wretchedly paid, have no sort of equality with classical masters, and are considered to belong to an inferior grade. When they are foreigners they are looked upon as poor aliens. The belief that modern languages are easy, although erroneous, is against them, the truth being that the pupils do not go far enough in these languages to become aware of the real difficulties. They think that Italian is easy, not knowing that there are two thousand irregular verbs, and they think that French is easy, not knowing that French boys, specially

Teachers of Modern Languages in England. Their low Status.

Supposed Facility of Modern Languages.

drilled and disciplined in their own tongue, have to be wary to avoid its pitfalls.

The results of the improved teaching of modern languages have not yet had time to become visible in France. Teachers tell me that amongst their pupils a certain proportion show a natural taste and aptitude, and take heartily to their work.* The rest count for nothing, and will retain only a limited vocabulary. In England some knowledge of modern languages is, as yet, much more general, but it seldom reaches the degree of what can be seriously called "learning." The practical difficulty is that the unripe minds of young students, especially of young ladies, are not ready for the strongest books, and they take no interest in the history and development of a language, so they soon fall back upon the easy and amusing literature of the present, to the neglect of the great authors. That is the misfortune of modern languages as an intellectual pursuit.

Quality of the Pupils in France.

Rarity of Learning in Modern Languages.

The Practical Difficulty.

* The following is a genuine English address from pupils in a Parisian *lycée* to their master:—

"My dear and respected Professor—I take the liberty of testifying the feelings of gratitude which animate us all since we have been under your tutorship.

"No doubt we have been lacking in zeal and attention, but we nevertheless appreciate fully the pains you have evidently taken for our benefit. We therefore assure you that if you are not satisfied, we take the engagement to strive to do better hereafter; and you shall see that we will be faithful to our word.

"We terminate with the desire that you will sincerely accept this as a true testimonial of our real affection and respect."

Creditable, though not faultless.

Rare Appreciation of Foreign Poetry.

It very rarely happens that a reader of either nationality has any appreciation of the poetry of the other. We may begin by setting aside that immense majority of prosaic minds which exist in all countries, and for whom all poetry must be for ever unintelligible. After them come those lovers of poetry who enjoy rhyme but cannot hear the music of blank verse. The French are in that position with regard to English poetry, though they claim an appreciation of blank verse in Horace and Virgil. Then, even in rhymed poetry, there remains the prodigious difficulty of pronunciation. Sound and feeling must go together in poetry, but the foreigner rarely has the sound. And even if he could imitate sounds exactly there would still remain the lack of those early associations to which poets are constantly appealing, both by subtle allusion and by the affectionate choice of words. The foreigner, too, has a difficulty in gliding over the unimportant expletive phrases; they acquire too much consequence in his eyes. The conventionalisms of the art strike the foreigner too forcibly. When an Englishman, in reading his own language, follows poetic ideas, a Frenchman is embarrassed by what seems to him the lawlessness of the versification, and he seeks for rules. On the other hand, the elaborate rules of French versification seem pedantic to an English mind, which perceives no necessary connection between such artificial restraints and the agile spirit of poetry. Was ever yet English scholar so learned that he could feel properly shocked by what shocks a French critic in verse? How is the foreigner to disengage the poetic

Blank Verse.

Rhyme.

Expletive Phrases.

Difficulties in English Poetry for Frenchmen.

English Difficulties with French Verse.

from the conventional element? Since both English and French scholars believe that they have mastered all the secrets of Greek and Latin versification, it might be inferred that there is no insuperable difficulty in that of a modern tongue; yet where is the Englishman, except Mr. Swinburne, who in reading a French poem knows good technical workmanship when he sees it?*

Technical Workmanship.

Conventionalism of French Ignorance.

French ignorance of English literature would be amazing if it were not the result of a conventionalism. It is conventionally "ignorance" in France not to have heard of Milton; it is not ignorance never to have heard of Spenser. A Frenchman is ignorant if the name of Byron is not familiar to him, but he need not know even the names of Shelley and Keats. He is not required, by the conventionalism of his own country, to know anything whatever of living English genius. A London newspaper amused itself with sketching a possible Academy for England, and named some eminent Englishmen as qualified to be members. The names included Browning, Ruskin, Arnold, Lecky, and other first-rate men. On this, certain Parisian journalists were infinitely amused. Their sense of the ludicrous was irresistibly tickled when they saw that individuals like these, whom nobody had ever heard of, could be proposed as equivalents for the forty French immortals.

A proposed English Academy.

Independently of learning, modern languages are supposed to be useful for conversation. They are,

* A writer in the *Saturday Review* answers this by saying that he understands French verse. No doubt he sincerely thinks he does.

however, very rarely studied or practised to the degree necessary for that use. The foreigner may be able to order his dinner at his hotel and ascertain when the train starts, but in cultivated society he only pretends to be able to follow what is said. His impressions about the talk that is going on around him are a succession of misunderstandings. He sits silent and smiling, and he endeavours to look as if he were not outside and in the dark; but he *is* in the dark, or, worse still, surrounded by deceptive glimpses. It would be better if French or English were like Chinese for him.

Rarity of Conversational Accomplishment in Foreign Tongues.

The Foreigner in Society.

The future towards which we are rapidly tending may already be seen in the distance. Latin and Greek will be given up for ordinary schoolboys, both in England and France, but the study of them will be maintained by a small *élite*. This *élite* will have a better chance of existence in England, where superiorities of all kinds are not only tolerated but respected, than it can have in France, where the modern instincts all tend to the formation of an immensely numerous, half educated middle class. When the classical literatures shall be pursued, as the fine arts are now, by their own elect, and not imposed on every incapable schoolboy, they will be better studied and better loved. Now, with regard to modern languages I have no illusions left. You cannot convert a Philistine into a lover of good literature by teaching him a foreign tongue. If he did not love it in his own language, he is not likely to take to it in another. Every man has his own intellectual level, and on that level he will remain, whatever

The Future.

Abandonment of Latin and Greek.

An *élite*.

Modern Languages.

Men remain on their own Level.

language you teach him. To make a Frenchman appreciate Milton or Spenser, it is not enough to teach him English; you would have to endow him with the poetic sense, with the faculty that delights in accompanying a poet's mind—in a word, with all the poetic gifts except invention. Neither are all men fit to read noble prose. Minds incapable of sustained attention read newspaper paragraphs in English, and in French they would still read newspaper paragraphs. What I mean is that languages do not elevate the mind, they merely extend the range of its ordinary action. Teach a French gossip English and she will gossip in two languages, she will not perceive the futility of gossiping. This explains the poor and mean use that is constantly made of modern languages by many who have acquired them, and the remarkable unanimity with which such people avoid every great author, and even all intelligent intercourse with foreigners, reading nothing and hearing nothing that is worth remembering.

Languages do not elevate the Mind.

Mean Use made of Languages.

In all things connected with education we are in a world of hollow pretensions. The speeches at prize distributions assume that pupils will make use of their knowledge afterwards. They are told that the wonderful literatures of Greece and Rome now lie open before them like gardens where they have but to wander and cull flowers. If they have studied modern languages they are told that European literature is theirs. The plain truth is, that both in England and France, and especially in France, there is a small studious class isolated in the midst of masses occupied with pleasure or affairs, and so in-

Hollow Pretensions.

Smallness of the Studious Class.

different to intellectual pursuits that the slightest mental labour is enough to deter them. Whatever reading they do is in the direction of least resistance. They have no enterprise, they find all but the easiest reading irksome, and the obstacle of the easiest foreign language insurmountable. They will play cards or dominoes in the day-time rather than take down a classic author from his shelf. A guest in a French château told me that on seeing the ennui that reigned there, whilst nobody read anything, she asked if there were any books in the house, and was shown into a library of classics formed in a previous generation but never opened in this. All testimony that comes to me about French interiors confirms the belief that the number of people who form libraries has greatly diminished. It was once the custom in the upper class, but nobody would say it is the custom now. In twelve or fifteen country-houses known to a friend of mine there was only one library, and, what is more significant, only one man deserving the name of a reader. Even in England, where people read certainly three times as much as they do in France, the expenditure on books bears no proportion to income, except in the case of a few scholars. How many English houses are there, of the wealthy middle class, where you could not find a copy of the representative English authors, and where foreign literatures are unknown!

Idleness of the unintellectual.

Libraries in French Houses.

Expenditure on Books in England.

Unknown—with one exception. The belief that Hebrew literature is one book, and that it was

English knowledge of the Bible.

written by God himself and that the English translation of it has a peculiar sanctity, has given the English middle class a familiarity with that literature which is a superiority over the French middle class. The French Catholic laity only knows the Bible through *l'Histoire Sainte* and selections; the unbelievers take no interest in it. Nothing surprises an Englishman more than French ignorance of the Bible; yet it is probable that if ever the English cease to believe in the dogma of inspiration they will neglect the whole Bible as they neglect the Apocrypha now.

Possibility of Future Neglect.

Scientific Education.

Usefully educated Young Men.

Science has a stronger basis than literature in modern education because it offers useful results. In France the usefully educated young men are well educated in their way. The time spent on their education is strictly economised with a view to a definite result, and the effect of it is to turn out numbers of young men from the *École Centrale* and other schools who at once enter upon practical duties with a readiness that speaks much for the system. They are, however, so specially prepared that they have omitted the useless and the superfluous—*"le superflu, chose si nécessaire!"* In cutting away the superfluous the practical educator throws literature overboard. Well, without literature, it is still possible to sharpen the faculties and store the mind, but without literature education misses what is best and most interesting in the world. To a generation "usefully" educated Europe will be like a new continent destitute of memories and associations, a

Sacrifice of the Superfluous.

Effects of the Loss of Literature.

region where there are mines to be worked and railways to be made.

French Secondary Education.

As the French system of secondary education extends over the whole country, an account of the most important changes in it may be worth giving in a few words.

The Old System.

The old system, from the time of Napoleon I. to the middle of the century, was founded on classical studies, with lighter scientific studies and those chiefly mathematical. After taking their bachelor's degree, those students who were intended for certain Government schools *(Écoles Polytechnique, Centrale, Normale supérieure pour les sciences)* received further scientific instruction in special classes. This was the old system, but in 1853 an important change was introduced by M. Fortoul's ministry, which invented what was long known as the *bifurcation*. On leaving the fourth class, at the age of thirteen or fourteen, pupils were required to choose between literary studies with a slight scientific supplement or the converse. Both kinds of students continued at that time to attend together the lectures on history and geography, and so much of modern languages as was then taught, besides the classes for Latin translation and the French classes. This was the system known as the *bifurcation*, but it did not work very well in practice, because the scientific students fell too far behind the literary students to follow profitably the same Latin classes.

The *Bifurcation*.

The *Bifurcation* did not work well.

In October 1864, under Duruy's ministry, there

The *Enseignement Spécial.*

was a new departure. He established the *enseignement secondaire spécial.* This scheme of teaching excluded Latin, which was replaced by a modern language, and it embraced rather an extensive programme, outside of classical studies, with such subjects as mathematical and natural science, political economy, and law.

Present State of the *Enseignement Spécial.*

Under the existing system the *enseignement spécial* includes two modern languages instead of one, and of these one is taken as "principal," the other as "accessory," at the student's choice, he being more severely examined in that which he selects as "principal." The present varieties of public secondary education may be described under three heads.

Present Varieties in French Secondary Education.

1. Ancient languages, with a little science and one modern language.

2. Scientific education, with a little Latin and one modern language.

3. Scientific education, with two modern languages, no Latin.

Necessity for using Acquirements.

Enough has been already said in this chapter on the degrees of proficiency attained. My own belief is that no acquirement whatever really becomes our own until we make constant use of it for ourselves, and it is impossible to make a constant use of more than a very few acquirements. It is here, in my opinion, that is to be found the true explanation of that perpetual disappointment which attends almost all educational experiments. They may provide the instrument; they cannot insure its use. This is what makes pro-

fessional education, of all kinds, so much more real than any other, and the scientific professions do certainly keep up the scientific spirit. There is not any profession (certainly not school-teaching or hack-writing) which maintains the pure literary spirit in the same way.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### ARTISTIC EDUCATION.

Qualities of French Art Education.

In both music and drawing the French have shown themselves far better educators than in languages. Their ways of teaching drawing are especially marked by seriousness, by the discouragement of false, ignorant, and premature finish, by the wise use of simple and common materials, and by the consistent aim at sound knowledge rather than vain display. As the French have taught painting and sculpture they are both most serious pursuits; I mean that, if the French may often have been frivolous in the subsequent employment of their knowledge, they were assuredly not frivolous in the acquisition of it. For them the fine arts have been a discipline, a culture that has penetrated beyond the artist class.

Serious Nature of French Teaching.

French Disinterestedness.

The seriousness of French teaching has been accompanied by an admirable disinterestedness. Artists of the highest reputation, every hour of whose time was valuable, have been willing to undertake the direction of private schools of painting on terms that barely paid the rent of the studio and the hire of models. There they have given the most sincere and kindly advice to hundreds of students, both Frenchmen and foreigners, from whom they

Generosity of distinguished French Artists.

had nothing to expect but a little gratitude, and, perhaps, the reflected honour of having aided one or two youths of genius amidst a crowd of mediocrities.

In England this kind of teaching is all but unknown, yet a certain culture of the faculties by means of drawing is incomparably more general than it was in the beginning of the century. The total number of "persons taught drawing, painting, or modelling through the agency of the Science and Art Department" is now approaching a million, and this independently of the considerable numbers of young English people who study art privately or in other schools. The result of this culture is already plainly visible in the wonderful improvement of English taste and skill in everything that art can influence, an improvement that nobody could have foreseen in the first half of the present century.

Extension of Art Teaching in England.

Results in the Improvement of English Taste and Skill.

In France, too, great efforts have been made to spread a knowledge of sound elementary drawing amongst the people. It is now a part of the regular course of education for the middle classes in the *lycées*, and there are cheap public drawing schools all over the country. In England this is a new enterprise, in France it is an attempt to recover lost ground; as the French workmen of the eighteenth century were certainly more artistic than their successors, and must have understood design more thoroughly. Even in the Middle Ages, as we know from the excellence of the work left to us, the common workmen cannot have been ignorant of art.

French Efforts in Popular Art Education.

The real motive for this modern increase in art-

The real Motive.

France and England not Artistic Nations. French Provincial Towns.

culture is not the disinterested love of art, it is the desire for commercial success. France and England are not now really artistic nations. In the French provincial cities the modern buildings, which are so rapidly replacing what remains of the mediæval ones, display, as a rule, no artistic invention whatever, and if the English people were suddenly to awake one morning with an artist's passion for the beautiful they would not be able to endure the prevalent ugliness of their towns. Still, though the nations are not artistic, both races produce exceptional persons who are so, and these are allowed to have their own way more than formerly in the warfare that they wage against the hideous or the commonplace.

The Argument for the Beautiful.

Their argument in favour of the beautiful is the very simple one that it makes life pleasanter and, so far, happier, and in some of them this argument takes the kindly form of desiring, especially, to make beautiful things accessible to the poor. They might even go further, and affirm that beautiful surroundings are favourable to health, which they certainly are, by ministering to gaiety and cheerfulness and so increasing the charm of life. The perception of this truth would produce a very close alliance between philanthropic and artistic spirits, as we see already in the generous and thoughtful founders of the Manchester Art Museum.

Value of Beautiful Surroundings.

Art education is an attempt to return consciously to conditions of life which have long ago been attained unconsciously and afterwards departed from. There are now many schools of art in Lancashire by way of reaction against the ugliness of the industrial

Art in Lancashire.

age. There was a time when Lancashire knew neither ugliness nor schools of art. The habitations of the Lancashire people in the sixteenth century, and for some time later, were always artistic, whether magnificent or simple, and so was the furniture inside them. The art was not of an exquisite or an elevated order, but it *was* art, and it was interesting and picturesque. The beauty of nature, too, was quite unspoiled, and though Lancashire was no more Switzerland than Manchester was Verona, still there was beauty enough in the county for all ordinary human needs; the pastoral valleys were green, the trout-streams pure, and if the skies were often gray it was only with clouds from the sea. The industrial epoch came and destroyed all this; it destroyed the vernacular architecture, it filled the beautiful valleys with the ugliest towns in the world, it fouled both the streams and the sky, it rapidly diminished even the health and beauty of the race. It is the conscious reaction against these evils which has made Lancashire a centre of artistic effort.

A former artistic Condition.

The unspoiled Beauty of Nature.

The Industrial Epoch.

In France there has never been the same acute consciousness that modern life was making itself hideous; and, in fact, the conditions of urban life in France, except in certain quarters of Lyons and Marseilles, very rarely approach the melancholy imprisonment of an English manufacturing town. Most of the French towns are comparatively small, the country is easily accessible on all sides, they all have avenues of trees (many of them really magnificent), and those which are situated on the great rivers have spacious and well-built quays, which are

Conditions of Urban Life in France.

the favourite residence and resort. In a word, the difference between urban and rural life is seldom painfully or acutely felt. It is, I believe, a consequence of this comparative pleasantness of French country towns that the artistic life in them is so torpid. Provincial exhibitions are, in France, quite incomparably inferior to English provincial exhibitions. The fine arts are much more successfully cultivated in Manchester and Liverpool than in Rouen or in Lyons. As for the smaller French towns, you find in them here and there an intelligent amateur, here and there a respectable artist, but, by the ordinary French *bourgeois*, art is not understood, it lies outside of his interests and his thoughts. He can no more appreciate style in painting and sculpture than he can appreciate it in literature. He lives in a country where you can hardly travel fifty miles without meeting with some remnant of noble architecture, and it has been necessary to pass a law to protect what remains against his ignorant spoliation. Contemporary provincial building is, as a rule, only masons' work, and whenever an old church or a château is in any way meddled with, the chances are that it will be ruined beyond remission. The provincial nobility very rarely give any evidence whatever of artistic culture or attainment. If they attempt anything, the result is poor and incongruous, some pepper-box turret added to the corner of a modern house, or some feeble attempt to imitate the mediæval castle.

Artistic Torpor.

Inferiority of French Provincial Exhibitions.

The French *bourgeois*.

His Ignorance of Art.

Provincial Building.

The Provincial Nobility.

It may seem a contradiction to have begun this chapter with hearty praise of French methods in

art-teaching, and to have continued it with depreciation of French taste, but, in fact, both praise and its opposite are deserved. Paris has maintained the light of art in France. Without Paris, contemporary France would have a very small place in artistic Europe; with Paris it still maintains, though against powerful rivals, a leadership. London has not any comparable influence. Many of the best English Academicians, including the President, have studied their art abroad. The methods of English Academical teaching, which require a minute and trifling finish in mere studies, are a waste of the pupil's time.

Paris the maintainer of Art in France.

English Academical Teaching.

The English race, usually destitute of any artistic faculty or perception, produces exceptional geniuses in quite as great numbers as the French. The faculties that raise art above mere technical cleverness to the region of poetry are not excessively rare in the home of poetry itself. In fact, the English tendency has been to rely upon native gifts too much, to the neglect of handicraft, yet even in artistic handicraft the English have made surprising progress in the thirty years between 1850 and 1880. Their art critics go on repeating the old complaint that there is little above the common level, but the common level itself has risen, and the complaint amounts merely to the truism that exceptional excellence is exceptional.

Exceptional Genius in England.

Poetic Art in England.

Improvement in English Handicraft.

Elevation of the Common Level.

The attainments of artists are, no doubt, a matter of national concern, as are the accomplishments of all workers; nevertheless, it is still more important,

The General Understanding of Art.

from the intellectual point of view, that art should be understood by many than that it should be dexterously practised by a few. Now, as to this separate question of intelligence concerning the fine arts, I have said elsewhere, and can only repeat, that in Paris it is wonderfully general, but not in the French provinces. Intelligence of that kind is common, without being general, in London, and not very rare in the other great English towns, whilst Edinburgh is incomparably more important as an art-centre than either Lyons or Marseilles. Neither the English nor the French aristocracy has ever, as a body,* shown an intelligent interest in art. For some reason that may be connected with the contempt felt by a *noblesse* for manual labour, the understanding of art seems to belong chiefly to the middle and lower classes, who often find in it a substitute for more expensive pleasures. As for the future, this kind of intelligence is likely to increase widely in the same classes, especially if art is more intimately associated with handicrafts and manufactures.

Paris and the Provinces.

London.

Edinburgh.

Art in the Middle and Lower Classes.

The Particular Difficulty of the English.

If I were asked what is the particular difficulty that usually prevents the English from understanding art, I should answer, The extreme energy and activity of their moral sense. They have a sort of moral hunger which tries to satisfy itself in season and out of season. That interferes with their understanding of a pursuit which lies outside of morals. The teach-

* There have been a few exceptions, such as Lord Egremont and the Duc de Luynes.

ing of their most celebrated art-critic, Mr. Ruskin, was joyfully accepted by the English, because it seemed for the first time to place art upon a substantial moral foundation, making truth, industry, conscientiousness, its cardinal virtues. The English imagined, for a time, that they had subordinated the fine arts to their own dominant moral instincts. Painting was to abandon all its tricks and become truthful. It was to represent events as they really occurred, and not so as to make the best pictures, a sacrifice of art to veracity that pleased the innermost British conscience. Again, it was assumed that mere toil in the accurate representation of details was in itself a merit, because industry is meritorious in common occupations. In short, all the moral virtues were placed before art itself, which, in reality, is but accidentally connected with them.

Mr. Ruskin's Moral Criticism.

The Sacrifice of Art to Veracity.

Toil in Details.

The English love of nature, in itself one of the happiest of all gifts, has not been altogether favourable to the understanding of art. It has led many English people to subordinate the fine arts entirely to nature, as if they were but poor human copies of an unapproachable divine original. In reality the fine arts can only be understood when they are pursued and valued for themselves.

The English love of Nature.

An Impediment to the Appreciation of Art.

The feebler moral sense of the Parisian mind and its less passionate affection for nature have left it more disengaged and more at liberty to accept art on its own account, as art and nothing more. There is a kind of Paganism which is able to rest content

The Parisian Mind.

without deep moral problems, and to accept with satisfaction what art has to give without asking for that which it cannot give.

Diversity of Ideals.

The final word on the subject may be that there is a diversity of ideals, that the English ideal (speaking generally) is moral, and the Parisian ideal artistic.

## CHAPTER IV.

### MORAL TRAINING.

Difficulty of the Subject.

THIS chapter is very difficult to write, because I shall have to deal with what cannot be accurately ascertained. A man can hardly know how far he has been successful in the moral training of his own sons. As to the boys in the nearest school, he may ascertain what is taught them by their masters, but he cannot know the effects of the teaching on the formation of their characters; that can only be known much later, if at all. And when we pass to distant schools our knowledge must be so general and so vague that no trustworthy argument can be founded upon it.

The Effects of Moral Teaching not easily ascertained.

Personal Influence.

The truth is that moral training is chiefly an affair of personal influence, and that influence of this kind is a special gift. For example, Dr. Arnold had the gift in the supreme degree, but a man might be placed in control of the same educational machinery and yet be destitute of it.

However, some general truths may be taken note of, and they may help us to understand the subject so far as it can be said to be intelligible.

Necessity of a National Moral Sense.

First, you require material to work upon in a national moral sense, and here I have just said that the English have the advantage. The moral sense

is (on the whole and in spite of many exceptions) very much stronger in England than in France. The English (except their men of the world) still retain in a great degree the healthy state of moral feeling which is capable of being really shocked and horror-stricken by turpitude and vice; the French lose this freshness of feeling very early in life, and look upon turpitude and vice very much as an English man of the world looks upon them, as a part of the nature of things too familiar to excite surprise. It does not follow that they themselves are base and vicious, but they know too much, and they know it too early, about the evil side of life.

Want of Freshness of Feeling in France.

The English, too, have a great advantage in the possession of a national institution which exists far more for moral training than for anything else. The Church of England is much less of a theocracy than the Church of Rome, and much more of a moral influence over the ordinary laity. Its clergy are nearer to the laity than the Roman Catholic clergy are, and their influence is on the whole a more pervading and efficient influence. The great difficulty about the moral training of the young is that it can only be done well and efficiently by authority. Ecclesiastical institutions invest the teacher with this authority far better than any others. The clerical teacher, with the Church behind him, is free from the perplexing task of reasoning about morals; he has only to require obedience. His very costume separates him from all laymen, and gives a weight and seriousness to his teaching that they cannot impart to theirs. For this reason almost all parents, until re-

Moral Influence of the Church of England.

Authority needed with the Young.

Value of Ecclesiastical Institutions.

Special Authority of the Clergy.

cent years, have been anxious to place their children under the authority of priests, and have often done so when they themselves had no belief in theological doctrines. They did not seek the theocratic power, but the moral power that was connected with it.

The Difficulty of Clerical Education.

In course of time, however, a most formidable difficulty arises. Clerical education may be morally most beneficial, but it can only be so whilst the pupil himself is a sincere believer. If he is not, the effect of clerical education is not moral, but the contrary, as it compels him to learn the arts of dissimulation. The clergy do not say in plain terms that deceit and imposture are virtues; they class them, nominally, in the category of vices, but the intelligent pupil soon perceives that he is rewarded for practising them and punished for not practising them. "Many unbelievers," said a truthful Frenchman to me, "come out of our clerical seminaries, but the acquired habit of dissimulation remains with them, and they are never plain and straightforward in after life." Perhaps it may be said that I attach too much importance to truthfulness, that a certain degree of dissimulation is necessary in the world, and that it may as well be learned at school as in practical affairs. I only know that truthfulness is one of the social virtues, though it is often directly contrary to the interests of those who practise it. Being a social virtue, and favourable to public interests, it ought to be encouraged in public education. Now, it so happens, whether for good or evil, that the majority of French laymen of the educated classes are unbelievers, and I say that no moral purpose can be an-

Effect of it on Unbelievers.

Truthfulness especially a Social Virtue.

Unbelievers numerous in France.

swered by bringing them up in habits of hypocrisy. I am told by those who are in a position to judge accurately, that is to say, by intelligent men who have lived all their lives in the University, that four out of every six professors are Agnostics, and that the proportion amongst the present generation of their pupils is even larger. Under these circumstances the idea of handing over the national University to the priests is inadmissible by any one who cares for liberty of conscience; and if the reader thinks that liberty of conscience is a luxury for Protestants only, and that Agnostics have no right to it, I cannot agree with him.

Agnostics in the French University.

Unfortunately, however, it is found in practice that liberty of thought in religious matters not being itself founded upon authority, but on the exercise of individual reason, is unfavourable to moral authority, especially over the young. In fact, reason and authority are incompatible. We rule our children by authority when they are young, without stopping to reason; when they are grown up we endeavour to influence them by reason, but our authority, as such, has departed. The Church of Rome avoids this difficulty by founding all her teaching on authority. Even when she condescends to reason, every one knows that the principle of authority is behind and can be used, like a royal prerogative, to cut short discussion at any moment.

Liberty of Thought unfavourable to Moral Authority.

Incompatibility of Authority with Reasoning.

Principle of the Church of Rome.

Now, as a matter of simple fact, it must be admitted that the moral authority of French lay teachers is inadequate. They have not the power of the priests, nor even of the English clergy. And the

French Lay Teachers wanting in Authority.

consequence is that a new generation of Frenchmen is growing up under insufficient moral control. I make no attempt to disguise the evil, but cannot see how it was to have been avoided. It is an evil which lies before every country in Europe as the authority of religion becomes relaxed. Meanwhile, lay education, if not morally so strong as one might desire, is at least producing a generation of young men who are frank and fearless, and have an unaffected contempt for sneaks and hypocrites of all kinds.

One Good Effect of Lay Education.

What is wanted is a class of lay principals with something like the moral authority of Dr. Arnold; but would Dr. Arnold have possessed that authority, or anything approaching to it, if he had been a layman?

Dr. Arnold.

I myself have known very intimately and for many years a French principal who would have delighted in exercising Arnold's power for good if he had possessed it, but he was a layman only, and did not possess it.

A French Principal.

In family life there may be a kind of sacerdotal authority in the head of the household when he exercises a sacerdotal function, when he compels his household to join him in family prayer and to listen respectfully whilst he reads and expounds the sacred books. The father assumes in that manner a moral authority that is not easily assumed in any other way.

Sacerdotal Authority in Family Life.

Still, in many French families, the father is anxious to do what he can, and this is one of his strongest reasons against clerical education in the

Clerical Jealousy of Family Influence.

ecclesiastical seminaries. The clerical teachers, in their desire to establish an uncontested religious influence over the boys, look upon the father and mother as rivals, and do not permit the boys to return home, except during the vacations, even when the parents live in the very town where the seminary itself is situated. In this way home influence is almost annihilated, and clerical influence substituted for it. But the moralising and civilising power of the home influence may be too precious to be sacrificed, and, as a matter of fact, when the children are educated by laymen, it is almost the only influence of that kind that remains. In France it is especially the mother who civilises boys. Lads who are too much shut up in the *lycées* may get what the French call "instruction," but they do not get what is called "education." The pupils imprisoned in the ecclesiastical seminaries acquire, certainly, an oily smoothness of manner and a much greater degree of docility than the *lycéens,* because they have been more thoroughly broken in.

Value of Home Influence.

Manners acquired in the Seminaries.

Home Influences undervalued in England.

In England the home influences are much undervalued. Wealthy English parents soon despair of doing anything themselves for the moral training of their children, so they "pack them off" to some distant school to be placed under the influence of masters whom they have never seen and of whom nothing is really known except that they are in holy orders. If an Englishman has been educated at home, or even near home, he is generally rather ashamed of it, and unless he is exceptionally forcible in after life he is likely to be despised for it. Still,

the boy must be born in very unfortunate circumstances whose father and mother could not, if they chose, do more for his moral training than a schoolmaster who has perhaps fifty to attend to without the parental interest in any of them. The worst of the distant-school system is that it deprives the home residence that remains of all beneficial discipline, for the boys are guests during the holidays, and the great business is to amuse them. Then they go away to follow some profession, and the father, as he thinks over his fond dreams of companionship and paternal influence, may reckon (if the now useless calculation can still interest him) for how many months or weeks that influence has been directly operative in the whole course of his children's lives.

Parents and Schoolmasters.

Brief Duration of Paternal Influence.

For this reason the English grammar schools, though despised because they are cheap and easily accessible to the middle classes, may have a better effect on the family life of the country than the fashionable public schools. The idea would be to get both good home education and good school education at the same time, especially when the parents have the luck to live in the country. Rural life is good for boys, both physically and mentally; it gives them a healthy interest in a thousand things, especially in a rudimentary kind of natural history, and it prevents them from acquiring the premature cynicism and sharpness that are amongst the most undesirable characteristics of young Parisians.

English Grammar Schools.

Benefits of Rural Life for Boys.

The root of the moral difficulty is that the natural world is non-moral, and the natural world is

The Root of the Difficulty. The

Natural World.

all we have to appeal to when the various forms of the supernatural have all equally been rejected. After that we may argue that morality, in the most

The Argument from Social Interests.

comprehensive sense, is the only sound basis for human societies, and that all social interests are on the side of it. That, no doubt, is true, and it is a good subject for sound reasoning, but reason is not authority, it is only an attempt to persuade, and the boyish nature detests moral lecturing.

International Immorality.

Boys, too, are sharp enough to perceive that all morality is abandoned by common consent in the dealings between nations. Both England and France have been thoroughly immoral in their dealings with weaker States, and in recent times Germany has shown herself no better. It is difficult to maintain fine moral theories in countries whose practice so

The English Aristocracy.

openly contradicts them. Even the authoritative moral teaching of the English clergy, which may have had a good effect on the private lives of their

Want of Rectitude in its Judgment of Foreigners.

pupils, has not given them anything like stern rectitude of judgment concerning foreigners; for the English aristocracy admired Louis Napoleon, certainly one of the lowest characters that ever existed. It was also entirely on the side of the immoral slave power in the United States.

The one great anxiety that torments thoughtful Englishmen, and still more thoughtful Frenchmen, in the present day, is the establishment of an accepted moral authority. I am able to perceive only one that might be efficacious, and that is a severe public

Value of Public Opinion.

opinion. It may be answered that public opinion exists already; and so no doubt it does, but chiefly

to reward conformity and punish non-conformity in externals. We want a public opinion that would sustain and encourage every one in the practice of unostentatious virtues, especially in temperance, self-denial, and simplicity of life. As an example of what might be I may mention the French disapproval of debt. That is extremely strong, and as it is accompanied by the permission to live simply it does really operate as an effective restraint upon extravagance, at least in provincial life. The American disapproval of idleness, even in the rich, is another case in point, and in the English upper classes there is a general and salutary disapproval of everything that is held to be ungentlemanly. Notwithstanding what has been said in this chapter about the want of moral authority in laymen, they can effect something by combination. For example, military men are laymen, yet they keep up amongst themselves a splendid spirit of courage and self-sacrifice, and so do physicians and surgeons, with the addition of a manly charity and tenderness.

French Disapproval of Debt.

American Disapproval of Idleness.

English Reprobation of what is Ungentlemanly.

Military Professional Virtue.

Medical Professional Virtue.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE EDUCATION OF THE FEELINGS.

Mill's Opinion on French Feeling.

JOHN MILL pointed out long ago the advantage that the French have in the cultivation of the feelings. This is very much an affair of utterance in language, for it is utterance which best keeps feelings alive. French sympathy is often, no doubt, assumed; that is inevitable where so much sympathy is expressed; still, it is certain that in France all true sympathy does get expressed, and in this way people live surrounded by an atmosphere in which feeling remains active. In England the national reserve and the sharp distinction of classes are both against the cultivation of feelings, but besides this there is the pride of stoicism, the fear of seeming soft. The Frenchman's love for his mother is ridiculous in England; in France it is only natural. In truth, perhaps, it is not so much the sentiment that is ridiculous for Englishmen as the association of it with French expressions. The English do not laugh at it in Latin. The affection of Euryalus for his mother is thought beautiful in the Æneid, but turn it into French and it comes in those very phrases that Englishmen cannot abide. "J'ai une mère issue de l'antique race de Priam, une mère infortunée qui a voulu me suivre et que n'ont pu retenir le rivage

English Stoicism. The Frenchman's love for his Mother.

Euryalus.

natal d'Ilion ni les murs hospitaliers d'Aceste. *Cette mère je la quitte sans l'instruire des dangers où je cours et sans l'embrasser. Non, j'en prends à témoin et la Nuit et votre main sacrée, je ne pourrais soutenir les larmes de ma mère. Mais vous, je vous en conjure, consolez-la dans sa douleur, soutenez-la dans son abandon.*" The words that I have italicised are so perfectly French that they might be quoted from the last yellow-backed novel. The warm promise of friendship from Ascanius is also excessively French in sentiment. "Pour toi, Euryale, dont l'âge se rapproche plus du mien, admirable jeune homme, dès ce jour mon cœur est à toi, et je t'adopte à jamais comme compagnon de ma fortune: sans toi je n'irai plus chercher la gloire, et, soit dans la paix, soit dans la guerre, ma confiance reposera sur ton bras et sur tes conseils." One young Englishman would never speak like that to another, he might possibly go so far as to say, "Hope you'll come back all right."

Ascanius and his Sentiments of Friendship.

Un-English.

Do the English suppress feeling, or have they no feeling to be suppressed? The true answer to this question cannot be a simple one. English usages have a tendency to prevent the expression of feeling where it exists, and therefore they are not favourable to the culture of the feelings, still these exist naturally as blades of grass will grow between the hard stones of a pavement. It must, however, be admitted that although in England a man of feeling may certainly live, the moral climate is not so favourable to him as it is to one who feels much less and is therefore hardier. The Englishman who is best con-

Effect of English Usages.

The best constituted Englishman.

stituted for life in his own country is one who has just feeling enough to keep him right in all matters of external duty, but not enough to make him very sympathetic, or to give him any painful craving for sympathy. If he is sympathetic he will offer his sympathy where it is not wanted, and be hurt by the chilling acceptance of it, and if he has the misfortune to crave for sympathy he will suffer. So it comes to pass that the tenderer natures try to harden themselves by an acquired and artificial insensibility, whilst those which are not very tender find the conditions of existence more suitable for them. I had collected a number of examples, but do not give them, because instances prove nothing, and because it would be so easy to affirm that my examples were not truly representative. I prefer to take another course, and to suggest to the reader, if he is familiar with English life, the idea of making a little investigation on his own account, by consulting his own recollections. First, as to family affections, the reader has probably met with many cases in which the paternal and filial relations were cool and rather distant, so that separation was not painful to either party. If he has observed brothers he may have seen them practically almost strangers, living far apart, in different spheres, and seldom, if ever, corresponding. He may have known cousins, even first cousins, who did not remember their relationship so far as to announce to each other the occurrences of marriages and deaths. He may have observed that a slight impediment of distance or occupation is sometimes enough to prevent a relation from coming

Sympathy.

The tenderer Natures.

The Filial Relation in England.

The Fraternal.

Cousins.

to a funeral, and that the tombs of dead relations are sometimes left unvisited, uncared for, and untended. The reader may have noticed cases in which a difference of fortune produces a complete estrangement between very near relations, and finally he may have met with Englishmen who declared that friends were worth having because they could be selected, but that relations were a nuisance or "a mistake." Funerals. Neglected Tombs. Friends and Relations.

Cases like these are very numerous in England, because the affections are left to the chances of accident; they are not sedulously cared for and cultivated. When they are of great strength naturally, and when the conditions happen to be very favourable, there is nothing to prevent their growth, but in less favourable conditions there is nothing to keep them alive. In France all very near relations write to each other when they cannot meet personally on their fête days, all friends write at least a line or two for the New Year, and acquaintances exchange cards. An intelligent Frenchman said to me, "Our culture of the family affections is sometimes insincere, we sometimes express sentiments which are assumed for the occasion, but, on the whole, our customs tend to keep alive the reality of affection as well as its appearance, by reminding us of our relations and friends and of our duties towards them." Absence of the Culture of the Affections in England. Culture of the Affections in France.

What is the cause of this difference? Do the English really care less for each other than the French, or is there some hidden reason why they are less demonstrative? Cause of the Difference.

There is one reason—the English shyness, the English Shyness.

English fear of giving verbal utterance to feeling. Now, this is distinctly a want of culture, for the due expression of feeling is, in all the higher arts, one of the best results of culture. There can be no doubt that many Englishmen feel much more than they are able to express, and they certainly appreciate the power of utterance of others, as, for example, in their orators. A few Englishmen boldly go beyond and do express feeling, even in ordinary life, just as a few venture to talk like intellectual men. These few are not uncommonly found among the clergy, at least it has been so in my experience; and this may be due to the culture which religion gives to feeling, and, in the clergy, to the practice gained by the utterance of it in sermons and exhortations.

Due to a want of Culture.

Exceptional Englishmen.

The Clergy.

The idea that feeling is a weakness, and that it is well to suppress it in the education of boys, is more in accordance with the opinion of the Red Indians than with that of the ancient Greeks. The best education would respect all natural and healthy sentiment, such as a boy's love for his mother, without ridiculing it, but would at the same time train the boy in the courage which has always been compatible with tenderness, ay, and even with tears. Amongst the services of an unobtrusive kind which Queen Victoria has rendered to the English, one of the best has been by setting an example of openness in matters of feeling. She has permitted her subjects to see what she felt on many occasions, and has done this simply, plainly, and without the dread of sneering depreciation. The same healthy influence

The Best Education.

Queen Victoria.

is often exercised by women in narrower spheres. There is more than ever room for this feminine influence in an age like ours, when the positivism of the scientific and industrial temper, and the fierce competition amongst individual men, as well as between nations, are hardening the heart of the world. The due exercise and culture of the feelings are always appreciated at their right value in literature and the fine arts; it is a strange and striking anomaly that we fail to perceive their equal importance in the reality of life itself.

Feeling appreciated in Art but not in Life.

There is one department of the culture of feeling in which the English are far superior to the French —that of sympathy with the lower animals. The French are humane enough where human beings are concerned, but their humanity, as a rule, is confined to pity for the sufferings of their own species. There are exceptions, of course. I know several Frenchwomen who are full of sympathy for cats and dogs, and I have known French grooms who were thoughtful and kind and even affectionate in their treatment of horses; nevertheless, as a nation, the French are hard and pitiless in comparison with the English. All sentiments appear ridiculous when we do not share them, so the French laugh at English humanitarianism as the British critic laughs at a Frenchman's tenderness about his mother. My favourite French newspaper, the *Temps*, never misses an opportunity for a hit at this English eccentricity. French hardness dates from the time when the influence of the Church was universal; and, whether she taught the doctrine formally or not, her followers

English Tenderness for the Lower Animals.

French Hardness.

English Humanitarianism laughed at. The *Temps*.

Influence of the Church.

Animals are Infidels.

believed that animals, being unbaptized, had no rights. A dog or a horse is an infidel, and therefore cruelty to it is blameless. The decline of religious influence might have led one to hope for a broader charity, but there unhappily came the scientific spirit, which, though not cruel for the sake of cruelty, is heedless of animal suffering, and ready to inflict tortures on the lower animals worse than the torments of the Inquisition. So, in fact, the condition of the poor brutes has gone from bad to worse. There is, indeed, a French law for the protection of animals, but it is nearly a dead letter. The great practical difficulty in cultivating the feelings on this subject comes from the general but most unreasonable idea that there is something manly in being indifferent to the sufferings of brutes, and something childish in having pity for them. I remember a French gentleman who considered himself strong-minded because he made his carriage horses work when they had raws. In the lower classes men are proud of overloading and of making their horses go over unreasonable distances.* In both countries men are ready to inflict pain on animals whenever they think that they can get pleasure out of it for themselves. The passions for sport and *gourmandise* are the two which come next after science for pitiless-

The Scientific Spirit.

*La Loi Grammont.*

A French Gentleman and his Carriage Horses.

Sport and *Gourmandise.*

* French carters are superior to English in providing two-wheeled carts with breaks. I remember seeing the horses suffer very much for the want of them in steep roads and streets in England. The French, too, are usually very careful about balancing loads so as not to press heavily on the shaft-horse, but they are merciless in first overloading a cart and then beating the horse because the weight is beyond his strength.

ness. The infliction of wounds for amusement, and the boiling alive of lobsters, are common to England and France, but the following is, I believe, peculiarly French:—When we lived at Sens my wife discovered that it was the custom, when selling rabbits on the market-place, to put their eyes out with a skewer, from a belief that this cruelty improved the flavour.** I find that cooks are all convinced that boiling alive is necessary to the flavour of a lobster, and there is no reasoning with cooks and gourmands if they believe that cruelty heightens the delicacy of tortured flesh.

A Horrible Custom at Sens.

Amongst the sentiments that have been much cultivated in the past there is one which is less and less cultivated in modern France, the sentiment of reverence. The difficulty is to find objects for reverence that can effectually withstand the desecrating light of modern criticism. Good Catholics have still an object of veneration in the Pope and, in minor degrees, in the bishops and other priests; but since the death of the Count de Chambord there is not a single political personage left who excites veneration even in the mind of a royalist. The republicans venerate nobody, not even poor ex-president Grévy. Victor Hugo was, no doubt, regarded with veneration, but he has left no successor. Father Ingres was also really venerated by a certain sect of younger artists in his time. Chevreul, the centenarian, is respected for his achievements and for his hundred

The Sentiment of Reverence.

Veneration of the Priests by Catholics.

Absence of Veneration in the Republican Party.

Victor Hugo.

Ingres.

Chevreul.

* My wife had no rest till she had procured the abolition of this custom by an edict from the Mayor of Sens, but very likely it went on in private afterwards.

years. In this way two or three individuals in a century may excite some veneration, but the sentiment, outside of the Church, lacks continuity of culture. The true royalist sentiment is dead in France, the religious sentiment survives only in a part of the population, and is failing even there, whilst the French have not the vulgar veneration for titles which would at least exercise the faculty, though on low objects. Neither do the posts occupied by high officials under the Republic excite veneration in anybody. The royalists unanimously despise them, the republicans generally want to dismiss the present occupants and put other men in their places. In family life there is much affection certainly, and no doubt there is some respect, but there is no veneration. "Your sons," I said to an intelligent Frenchman, "treat you with much freedom. They do not seem to be in the least impressed by any idea of the paternal dignity."—"How can we expect them," he answered, "to be deferential and reverential to us when we, on our part, have set them, on every possible occasion, the example of a want of reverence towards the beliefs and the institutions of our fathers? They have heard nothing but criticism from our lips, they have grown up in an age of criticism, when there is nothing for the faculty of veneration to cling to." In a word, veneration had never been exercised or developed in their minds.

Extinction of Royalist Sentiment.

Want of Reverence for High Officials.

Absence of Veneration in Family Life.

In England this sentiment is less cultivated than in former times, but there still remain the Bible and the Throne. The House of Commons does not in-

Veneration in England. The Bible

spire it, the House of Lords is more and more failing to inspire it. The critical writing which is most keenly enjoyed is absolutely destitute of veneration. Looking to the future, a philosopher might ask himself whether the faculty was not destined to die out as having become useless. It is poetical, but it is not critical. When a poet does not feel it he feigns it; the critic knows that to approach a subject in a reverential spirit is to abdicate his own function. The misfortune is that when the common people cease to venerate they lose their interest in things. The fate of the Apocrypha is a significant illustration. The English no longer believe it to be inspired, they no longer venerate it, consequently they have ceased to read it. In France the Bible, for the same reason, is left unread by the Voltairean world. The old veneration for the Greek and Latin classics is passing away, and they will soon only be read by a few specialists. The French are losing their faith in the classics, once so staunch, with a rapidity that astonishes even those who are most familiar with French impulses. That was the last-surviving religion in intellectual France, and it is moribund.

and the Throne. Houses of Parliament. Critical Writing.

Veneration in Poetry.

Effects of the want of Veneration in the Common People.

Loss of Faith in the Classics.

## CHAPTER VI.

### EDUCATION AND RANK.

Education not a Mark of Class in France. Latin a Matter of Business.

Greater Value of English University Degrees.

FRANCE, being a more advanced democracy than England, has made greater efforts to bring secondary education within the reach of many, and the consequence is that such education, in that country, having ceased to be a mark of class, confers very little social position. The majority of French boys who learn Latin do it simply as a matter of business, the bachelor's degree being necessary to every physician and surgeon, to every barrister and notary, and even to every teacher of modern languages in the public schools. There are also examinations to be passed before practising pharmacy as a trade, and for that the examinations are not confined to the special science itself. In England the University degree is not absolutely required for the professions of law and medicine, and therefore it retains more of an ornamental character. It is more of an intellectual distinction and less of a matter of business than in France.

Tendency of Modern French Institutions. The *Bourgeois.*

To understand France in this and many other matters we must bear in mind that the whole tendency of modern French institutions is to produce, not what the English call the gentleman, but the middle-class man, or *bourgeois,* in enormous numbers. He is com-

fortably clothed, badly lodged, far too well fed, and educated in many studies, but not quite up to the point at which they would begin to be available for the intellectual life. The public schools where he gets this education are both too numerous in themselves and too numerously attended, besides being too cheap, for purposes of social distinction. All that education can do for a lad in France, at any school or college, is to place him in the *bourgeoisie,* that is to say, in the middle class. It does not, in the least, give him an approach to social equality with the aristocracy. Sons of peasants frequently rise in the *bourgeoisie* by means of University degrees; but that is not much, and there they stop. There is not any University degree, however elevated, not even the double doctorate, which is recognised by what is called "Society" as conferring any claim whatever to come within its pale. The University decorations of *Officier de l'Instruction Publique* and *Officier d'Académie* confer no social position. The fellowship of the University confers none either outside of the University itself.

What Education can do in France.

Degrees and Society.

In England the choice of school and University has an immense influence on a boy's future social position. Educate him at a grammar school or send him to Eton and Oxford, the difference to his future rank will be enormous. If an English mother has a son at Eton she is sure to let you know. All English people associate the idea of class distinctions with the different English schools, and they have an almost insuperable difficulty in realising the condition of things in France, where there is neither an Eton

Choice of School and University in England. Eton and Oxford.

nor an Oxford, nor anything in the least degree resembling them from the social point of view. In this way the English are always wrong about the French *lycées,* because they begin by imagining the English class distinctions. The prevalent English idea about them is that they are low and cheap places. One English writer accepted it as evidence of the very humble origin of a distinguished Frenchman that he had been educated in a *lycée.* He could not realise the simple fact that the *lycées* have nothing to do with social rank *either one way or the other.* My brother-in-law was educated at a *lycée,* and one of his ordinary class-fellows was a prince who is now actually reigning; other class-fellows may have been sons of small shopkeepers or poor clerks. Older Frenchmen are still living who were class-fellows of the Orleans princes at the *lycée Henri IV.* The princes worked like the others, and it was only thought a proof of their father's good sense that he sent his boys to one of the best schools in the town where he lived, though he happened to be King of the French. It was good for them, but it made no difference to the others, nor to the school. King Milan of Servia was afterwards educated at the same *lycée.*

English always wrong about French *Lycées.*

The Simple Fact.

Princely and Humble *Lycéens.*

Education of the Orleans Princes.

A boy gains no rank, and loses none, by being at a French *lycée.* It is true that the reactionary aristocracy looks upon the *lycées* with disfavour, but that is not because they are cheap,* or because some

Views of the Reactionary Aristocracy.

* The reason for the cheapness of the *lycées* is because they are not intended to be paying concerns (deficits being filled up by the State), and because the pupils benefit by the wholesale scale of all purchases, on which, of course, no profit is made.

of the pupils are poor, for the aristocracy is willing to send its children to priestly seminaries, which are still cheaper, and where most of the pupils are poorer. The reasons are not social, but religious and political. The *lycées* have lay masters, the seminaries have priests; the *lycées* are animated with a republican spirit, the seminaries are royalist. Everything has a political colour in France. When a young noble has not been to a seminary he is educated on its principles by a clerical tutor at home, or else in some Jesuit school abroad.

Religious and Political Reasons.

Not only does the place of education give no social position to a Frenchman, but education itself now gives him very little, because it has been made accessible to poor men. Eton and Oxford are respected because they are expensive;—if the same education, or a better, were given in cheap schools, it would lose its social significance. France seems to have reached, or almost reached, that point towards which the whole world is tending, when education will be too common to confer rank, and it is even possible we may get back to the middle-age idea that it is lordly to be illiterate. Even now, something of this sentiment is distinctly perceptible in France. Clever young men in the middle class are considered to be working creditably for persons in their line of life, but the nobility do not meet them

Education itself gives little Position in France.

Revival of the Middle-age Idea.

The Brilliant Nobility.

The buildings, being supplied by the towns and the State, are rent free. Some of the newer ones are magnificent. The *Lycée Lakanal*, near Paris, cost £400,000, and is a model of practical modern arrangement.

on that ground; they outshine them, not in learning, but in field-sports and equipages.

The Native Language.

A refined way of speaking the native language does something for social position in England. English people say of a man, "He has a good accent, he speaks like a gentleman;" in France so many middle-class people speak well habitually that pure speech has almost ceased to be a distinction. Even if the men had not broken down that barrier, clever French-women would have removed it. How many of them have I met with, in the middle classes, who, for enunciation, articulation, readiness and accuracy of expression, and precision of accent, spoke quite as well as ladies of rank! This, too, in a country where clear, and prompt, and accurate speaking is valued and appreciated to a degree unknown in England. It is only the most cultivated English people who dare to employ, in conversation, the full powers of their noble tongue; the others shrink from the best use of it, and accustom themselves to forms of speech that constitute, in reality, a far inferior language, in which it is so difficult to express thought and sentiment that they are commonly left unexpressed. An English friend of mine, himself a man of the very highest culture, says that the cultivated English keep their talk down to a low level from a dread of the watchful jealousy of their intellectual inferiors. They only dare venture to talk in their own way between themselves in privacy.

Clever French-women in the Middle Classes.

Rare Use of the Best English.

Passing from ordinary education to that higher culture which can only be attained by a sedulous attachment to intellectual pursuits in mature life, I

should say that here, again, mental elevation has nothing to do with social rank. In France the time is at hand, if it has not already arrived, when high culture may be taken as evidence that its possessor does not belong to the aristocracy. Speaking for the present of France only, I may offer two or three reasons in explanation of this curious anomaly. The French aristocracy, disdaining all work that is remunerative, does not enter the professions, and so misses the culture that the professions give. But, beyond this, the French aristocracy is unaccustomed to work of any kind, and as culture is usually unattainable without work, and as there is not even a high standard of early education in that aristocracy, it passes its time in ways that do not tend to culture except so far as polite and graceful social intercourse favours it. If the reader wishes to be just he will not think of the minor French rural aristocracy as "a class of rakes," but as a very numerous class of more or less wealthy idlers, living half the year on their estates, four months in some country town, and a month or two at Paris or the sea-side. Their life is healthy and natural for the most part, and they often attain a great age; but they are, as a class, much more addicted to rural sports than to intellectual or artistic pursuits of any kind. There are exceptions, of course, yet even the exceptions suffer from the benumbing influence of their surroundings, and usually stop short of any noteworthy attainment. I may repeat in this place a remark made to me by an observant Frenchman. He said, "In our country the men who cultivate themselves with effect are

Culture *versus* Rank.

French Aristocracy unaccustomed to work.

Character of the French Rural Aristocracy.

Intellectual Industry of some

Retired Tradesmen.

more frequently retired tradesmen than men born to independence. The retired tradesman has habits of industry which he applies to any pursuit that he takes up, and the want of these habits is fatal to the aristocrat." Another Frenchman, himself a man of culture, coincided, quite independently, with Matthew Arnold's well-known description of another aristocracy. "It is a strange result of the wealth and intelligence of the modern world," he said, "to give the upper classes the pursuits of the savage without the necessity which is his excuse for them. Our country gentlemen are not our intellectual leaders, they live a sort of perfected barbaric life. They are barbarians armed with the complicated appliances of civilisation. Their greatest glory is to have killed a large number of big wild boars, and they exhibit the heads as trophies. Another savage characteristic is that they despise trade and commerce, and consider all professions beneath them except that of the warrior. Their ideas of government by the simple authority of a despotic chief are also those of primitive man; they have not patience to endure the delays and the complicated action of parliamentary institutions. In a word, the liberty that wealth gives in the modern world means for them the liberty of the primæval instincts."

Barbarians in the Upper Classes.

Devotion to Barbaric Sports.

Contempt for Trade and Commerce.

Liberty of Primæval Instincts.

# PART II.

## PATRIOTISM.

## CHAPTER I.

### PATRIOTIC TENDERNESS.

THE tender feeling of patriotism, as distinguished from the proud, is more general in France than in England, and it has increased in France during the last twenty years, whilst it has diminished in England in the course of a generation, or during the transition from one generation to another. Tenderness has increased in France and diminished in England.

This difference and these changes are due to causes that may easily be seen in operation. We may be able to fix upon some of them, and whilst we are so occupied the reader is especially requested to bear in mind that the tenderness of patriotism is not the whole of patriotism, and that the Englishman who has little tenderness may be as patriotic in other ways as the Frenchman who has more. Causes of the Difference.

Tender patriotism in all cases attaches itself to the soil; it is an affection for the soil, and at first an affection for particular localities, generally with recognisable characteristics. One of the first effects of it is to produce a feeling of foreignness with regard to other parts of the same nation, so that by its particularism it may seem almost anti-patriotic. Local.

The Princess of Thule.

"I will never leave Borva," said the Princess of Thule, yet she did leave Borva, and sang her old island songs in the strange land and amongst the strange people "with her heart breaking with thoughts of the sea, and the hills, and the rude, and sweet, and simple ways of the old island life that she had left behind her."

Here is an example of tender patriotism, so much localised that the lover of her own country, which is one of the Hebridean islands, feels herself a foreigner in London, and it might be argued that every British subject ought to feel at home in the capital of the nation. Well, we are coming to that, but the first patriotism is local and pathetic.* No English novelist understands the sentiment of patriotic tenderness better than does William Black, and he always represents it as strongest in poor and thinly-peopled places, such as are to be found in the Western Highlands, and in the bleak archipelago between the Scottish mainland and the open Atlantic.

William Black. His understanding of Patriotic Tenderness.

Rural Life favourable to Tenderness.

Country life is highly favourable to the growth of a tender local patriotism, especially that kind of country life which remains stationary and attached to family possessions. Small estates are favourable to it, large estates less so, because they supply their

* I can speak from experience on this matter, having had in youth an intensely strong local affection for the wilder parts of northern England, a feeling that afterwards extended itself to Scotland, but I remember that when this feeling was strongest, the midland and southern counties were quite like a foreign country to me—a very dull, uninteresting foreign country—and I had no home feeling whatever in London, nor any desire to revisit it.

owners with the means of living at a distance, and especially for passing a part of the year in the capital, and other months out of the country altogether.

Colonisation is unfavourable to a tender English patriotism, because it diverts the affection of families from the soil of the mother country by giving them a second country beyond the sea, and by encouraging the idea that the mother country is but a part of a vast confederation, in which the colonists may have a patriotic feeling for the confederation generally, and a specially affectionate patriotism for the State or province in which they were born. Colonisation Unfavourable.

When the State is very heterogeneous in composition, including several very different nationalities, there may be a tender sentiment in each nation for itself, but this is not likely to extend to the entire State. Thus, a Scotchman may have a tender feeling for Scotland, an Irishman for Ireland, but their tender affection is not likely to include England, still less Canada and Australia. They may be proud of belonging to so great an empire, but that is another feeling. Composite States.

Every influence that increases the sensibility of the feelings is likely to increase the tenderness of patriotic sentiment. Religion and poetry are both strong influences in its favour, and a very powerful constant influence is that of a society in which feeling is habitually expressed as it is by the Irish and the French. A society in which the utterance of deep feeling of any kind is repressed by conventional good breeding, and by a kind of external stoicism, Effects of Religion and Poetry. Utterance of Feeling.

Its Stoical Repression.

is repressive of tenderness in patriotic sentiment. This stoical tendency in the English is more favourable to pride than to love.

Habits of Travel.

Habits of travel, habits of living abroad, cosmopolitan experiences on a large scale, diminish the intensity of local affection by affording opportunities for comparison, and so destroying illusions, especially about the grandeur of landscapes that have been dear to us in youth, and the appearance of houses and towns. After the Alps the English mountains are seen to be only hills, after Paris the northern towns look dismal.

Prosperity, Commercial and Political.

Lastly, a sustained commercial and political prosperity is unfavourable to the tenderness of national sentiment, because a very prosperous nation does not appeal to the pathetic sympathies, does not call for commiseration. The sons of a powerful and rich mother do not feel themselves to be so necessary to her as if she were afflicted and sorrowful.

Effects of these Causes in Modern England.

The reader will see at a glance how all these reasons against the tenderness of sentiment in patriotism tell in modern England.

Lack of small Proprietors.

England is not a country of small proprietors. Without committing the mistake, so common amongst foreigners, of believing that there are no small landowners in England, we know that they are not so numerous as in France, and therefore that the intense local affection of the peasant has fewer chances of developing itself. Again, the population of England is less and less a stationary population, it becomes constantly more urban and more migratory. The lower and middle classes change their place of

The Population not Stationary.

residence with a facility unknown to the yeomanry of former times. It seems to be a matter of indifference to them whether they will live in one ugly and smoky street or in another ugly and smoky street, and why indeed should we expect their affections to take root in a "wilderness of bricks"? Nor do they limit themselves to the same town. They change towns almost as easily as streets on the slightest prospect of increased income, and often merely for the sake of the change itself, to break the monotony of a life destitute of local interests and local attachments. In its extreme development the facility in removing that characterises the modern Englishman of the unsettled class will include not merely the United Kingdom, but the most remote dependencies of the British Empire. The following is a case well known to me; it is given here as an extreme case, not as an average one, but it is thoroughly English, and most remote from the stay-at-home habits of the French.

Facility in changing Residence.

A middle-class Englishman in a scientific profession began by going to Scotland in his youth, and there he married early. From Scotland he emigrated to New Zealand, and thence to Australia, where he prospered well, but in the midst of his prosperity he determined to return to Great Britain. He settled first in Glasgow, and afterwards migrated successively to Hull, Bristol, Cardiff, Southampton, Liverpool, and London. I pass over a temporary residence in the United States. When staying in one town it was his habit to change his residence frequently. During the thirty or forty years of his married life he

History of an English middle-class Family.

made twice as many removals. Since his death his family have gone on in the same way: they are constantly changing their addresses, and are dispersed over the British possessions, including New Zealand, Canada, and British Columbia. A family of this kind is not cosmopolitan, because it confines itself to English-speaking countries, but its world is the vast area over which the English language is known. There was a condition of feeling in that family quite incompatible with old-fashioned local attachments. The members of it were ready at any time to leave England and each other and pitch their temporary camp in distant latitudes. This readiness was reflected in their conversation, which ranged easily over vast spaces of land and sea.

Constant Changes of Address.

Condition of Feeling incompatible with Local Attachments.

I began by saying that this was an extreme instance, and so it is, but there are thousands of others that show the English facility of removal in minor degrees. Nothing is more characteristic of the English, or more unlike the French, than the courage to go and settle in some place where they know nobody and with which they have no previous associations. French people do it when forced by necessity, but they do it with a sad heart; English people of their own free will have the courage to sever old ties and begin new experiments of life.

English Courage in Emigration.

The extreme readiness of the modern English to change their residence is a recently-developed characteristic. It has grown with the modern facilities of communication. Sons and daughters disperse and settle anywhere. In wealthy families the eldest son retains possession of the paternal home, but

A Recent Characteristic.

seldom steadily settles down to live in it, whilst his brothers and sisters scatter themselves over the counties. The affectionate prejudices of local patriotism have given place to a broader national patriotism which, in its turn, is even now giving way to a still more comprehensive Imperial patriotism. It is a change by which the English have gained in grandeur of conception what they have lost in tenderness of feeling.

Local, National, and Imperial Patriotism.

Amongst the nations under the British crown there is one that still retains that tenderness in perfection. The Irish people have it, and they even keep it in exile. The reason evidently is that Ireland is a small well-defined nation, separated from England by salient national characteristics, and a nation which for a long time has been poor, unhappy, and ill-used. Here are all the influences that increase the pathetic tenderness of patriotic feeling. If ever Ireland becomes rich and happy her patriotism may be quite as powerful, quite as genuine, but it will lose that intense pathos.* The pathetic element in

Irish Tenderness.

Pathetic Feeling and its Causes.

* It is needless to quote Moore, but the reader may thank me for stealing for his benefit a short lyric by an Irish poet, Mr. Robert Joyce, which is full of the tender sentiment of patriotism, associating love and death in the most touching manner with the often-repeated name of one Irish valley—Glenara.

An Irish Poet.

I

O, fair shines the sun on Glenara,
And calm rest his beams on Glenara;
But Oh! there's a light
Far dearer, more bright,
Illumines my soul in Glenara—
The light of thine eyes in Glenara.

Pathetic Element in Scottish Patriotism.

Scottish patriotism was most intense when Scotland was poor, when the science and industry of her sons had not yet compensated for the barrenness of her soil.

Words-worth.

Of all the English poets Wordsworth had the tender local affections in the greatest strength; and in his case not only did they attach themselves to a small district with a marked peculiarity of character, but they were almost invariably associated with poor and simple human lives, themselves rooted by hereditary affection in the miniature highland region that occupies the north-west corner of England. London, to Wordsworth, was "a crowded solitude."

Attachment to Foreign Places.

English love for Switzerland.

No race in Europe has so strong a tendency as the English race to form attachments for places outside of the native land. This tendency has increased with the habit of travel and with the spoiling of England by modern industrial works. The second love of Englishmen is Switzerland if they are moun-

II

And sweet sings the stream of Glenara,
Glancing down through the woods like an arrow;
But a sound far more sweet
Glads my heart when we meet
In the green summer woods of Glenara,—
Thy voice by the wave of Glenara.

III

And O! ever thus in Glenara,
Till we sleep in our graves by Glenara,
May thy voice sound as free
And as kindly to me,
And thine eyes beam as fond in Glenara,
In the green summer woods of Glenara!

taineers, and Italy if they care for poetry and art. France they seldom appreciate unless they are architectural students, when they cannot overlook "the most architectural country in Europe." It is probable that no Englishman ever loved France as Robert Browning loves Italy, or would venture to express such a sentiment if he felt it.

Indifference to France. Love of Italy.

"Italy, my Italy!"

cries the poet with a passionate longing—

"Open my heart and you will see
Graved inside of it Italy,
Such lovers old are I and she,
So it always was, so shall ever be."

The love of a foreign language is enough to give us a friendly interest in the country where it is spoken to perfection, and as Englishmen are better linguists than the French, foreign countries have this attraction for them. They are also better scholars, and therefore may be more drawn towards Greece.

The Attraction of Greece for Englishmen.

Some Frenchmen have this second love, and when they feel nostalgia for any land out of France it is sure to be Algeria or Italy. Frenchmen never have any local affections in England. They may keep a grateful recollection of English houses where they have been kindly received, but have never any delight in England as a country. Their prejudices against its climate and about the absence of taste and art are ineradicable.

The French love Algeria or Italy.

The love that the French have for France is associated with many innocent illusions. They believe it to be the only perfectly civilised country in the

Love of the French for France.

Illusions.

world, the home of all the arts, of all scientific and intellectual culture. Of late years France is to the republicans the one country where political and religious liberty is complete. It is, of course, the land where French people feel most at home, where they can most readily get the superfluities which are necessary to them—the elaborately-ordered and complete repasts, the abundant fruits, the varied drinks, the talk in the *café,* the lively and pointed newspaper articles that they can understand at a glance, the clever plays that they listen to with such rapt attention. Those Frenchmen who believe in a Providence think that it has specially favoured their own country. *"Dieu protège la France."* Before the phylloxera came He gave his Frenchmen wine and refused it to the canting English, before the German invasion He gave them the intoxicating wine of victory. They have marvellous illusions about their climate; they think of it as a

France the Pet of Providence.

> "Fair clime where every season smiles
> Benignant."

Provincial Names.

Urban Names.

They have a full and fair appreciation of the beauty of their own country, and the more cultivated take an intelligent interest in the still numerous architectural remnants of the past. They have not forgotten the old provincial names, nor suffered them to fall into disuse; the Burgundian is still a Burgundian, though not the less a Frenchman too. Even the towns have an adjective for their inhabitants which strengthens the local tie. The inhabitant of Sens is a *Senonais,* of Poitiers a *Poitevin,* of Gap

a *Gavot*. In this way a Frenchman is the son of his native town, as an Oxonian of the University. The local feeling descends even to the villages— Village Patriotism.

*"Rien n'est plus beau que mon village*
*En vérité je vous le dis."*

This provincial feeling is not so strong in England. In the United Kingdom we have the four different nationalities, but in England only the counties, which answer to the French departments. England has no living tradition of historical provinces. We learn about ancient divisions in history, and that is all.

The words used in the two countries are in themselves an indication of the state of feeling. The word *pays*, as employed by journalists and politicians for the whole of France, is exactly equivalent to "the country" as employed by English politicians; but the word *pays*, as it is employed by a French peasant to mean locality to which he is bound by ties of birth and affection, has no equivalent in English, and it cannot be translated without a phrase. To get the force of it I must explain that it is a part of the country to which I and my family belong. But the greatest difference in language is the entire absence, in English, of any word having the peculiar emotional value, the sacredness, of *patrie*. The word *patrie* is reserved entirely for emotional use, it is *never* employed for common purposes. "Country" fails as an equivalent because it is used in various non-emotional senses, as when a minister appeals to the country by general elections, a huntsman rides

The Word *Pays*.

The Sacred Word *Patrie*.

"Country" not an Equivalent.

across country, a gentleman's residence is situated in a pretty country, a townsman goes to live in the country, a landowner is a country squire. Here the word stands for the everyday words *pays* and *campagne*, but *patrie* never stands for anything but the land that we should be ready to die for, and it is never used without visible or suppressed emotion. During the Franco-German war I knew French people who could not utter the word *"Patrie"* with dry eyes. The English are themselves fully aware of the power of a word, and of all that may be indicated by the possession of a word. They are proud, with just reason, of the word "home," and think that the absence of it in the French language shows a want of tenderness of domestic sentiment in the French mind. The absence of any equivalent for *patrie* may indicate a like want of tenderness in the patriotic sentiment.

Home.

Want of Cruel Experience in England.

Happily the English have not for many centuries been educated by the kind of experience most favourable to tenderness in patriotism. Their country has not been invaded. No Englishman knows what it is to have foreign soldiers ruling irresistibly in his own village and in his own home. No Englishman has seen his corn trampled by an enemy's cavalry, or his fruit-trees cut for fuel. In default of this experience no Englishman can imagine the sense of cruel wrong to their country that men feel when its sacred soil is violated.* The attempt to imagine it

The Sacred Soil.

Varying Intensity of Patriotic Sentiment.

* During and after the invasion the intensity of the patriotic sentiment was always in exact proportion to the harm done by the invader. It was very feeble where he did not appear, and

for the French only takes him from feeling to reason. He sees clearly that the French would have done as much on German soil had they been able to reach it, and from a reasonable point of view he perceives that no earthly soil is sacred. But the tender sentiment of patriotism, like other tender sentiments, is not amenable to reason.

stronger in proportion to the duration of his presence and the harm that he inflicted. It is still intense in Alsatia and Lorraine, and especially intense in the French who have been expelled from those provinces.

## CHAPTER II.

### PATRIOTIC PRIDE.

In the first chapter I indicated certain causes which make the patriotic sentiment less tender in England than in France. The same causes make English patriotism prouder than French patriotism.

Pride in old French Patriotism.

The element of pride was once intensely strong in French patriotism. Before the Franco-German war the Frenchman was as proud of his nationality as an ancient Roman; he sincerely believed his country to be *La Grande Nation*, and supposed that all the other peoples of the world must be humbly conscious of an immense inferiority. France, he believed, or rather he *knew*, was at the head of all nations both in arts and arms, the most military of countries, the most artistic, the most scientific—in all things and in all ways the greatest, the most illustrious, the best. I remember a conversation that took place in the spring of 1870 between two Frenchmen, a German, and myself. The Frenchmen were both scholarly and thoughtful men, immensely superior to the average of their countrymen, yet the old superstition about Gallic superiority was so inveterate in them that they maintained it at all points. The German and I ventured to doubt the absolute supremacy of France in literature and art, on which

*La Grande Nation.*

Immense Superiority of France.

A Talk in 1870.

our French friends fell back upon a quality which they affirmed to be beyond question, their undoubted military superiority. I remember the quiet, scarcely articulate protest of the German. He said that the military superiority of France, if put to the test *then* (1870) might not be quite so certain as in former times, as the Germans had made progress in the art of war. The French would not hear about the possibility of defeat; the incomparable *élan* of the troops, the well-known *furia francese,* was sure to carry everything before it.

Former Faith in Military Superiority.

Those were the last days of the pride of patriotism in France. Since 1870 no human being has heard any boasting of that kind from French lips.

End of French Patriotic Pride.

Before 1870 all French people had the sense of perfect security within their own frontier. They might send troops abroad, but at home they felt as secure as the English in their island. The sense of patriotic pride requires that feeling of security within the frontier, as much as the pride of wealth requires the sense of security from bailiffs. When the enemy is in possession, and the national forces are manifestly impotent to drive him out, there can be no national pride. There may be infinite devotion, and the most pathetic tenderness, but *"il n'y a pas lieu d'être fier."*

The Feeling of Security necessary to it.

Since their disaster the only pride of the French has been in their self-restraint, and in the quiet perseverance with which they have reconstituted their army. Such pride as there may be in these efforts is of a subdued nature, and altogether different from the boasting of other days. It may be admitted that

Improvement of French National Character.

the national character has been immensely improved by the extinction of the old sentiment, and even the French intellect has gained by it in the clearer perception of truth, as a private misfortune often opens the eyes of a family. The change in the national character of the French has been clearly manifested by their patience and prudence on several very trying occasions. They used to be rash and light-headed, they have become cool, wary, and circumspect; at one time they were reputed to be fond of war, and were easily led into it by any temporary ruler, but to-day they look on war so dispassionately, they treat it so purely as a matter of reason, that they will resort to it only with all chances in their favour. Men of sixty say that the young men of the present day have far less of national sentiment than they had in their own youth, which may be explained by the want of aliment for national pride. A new generation has grown up, and it has grown up in humiliation. A Frenchman of twenty-five has seen Alsatia and Lorraine in the hands of the Germans ever since he knew anything of geography.

Change from Rashness to Prudence.

Humiliation.

Another heavy blow to national pride in the higher classes has come from the internal, and probably final, victory of the democracy. All who belong in any way to the French aristocracy, or who aspire to belong to it, and have sympathy with it, feel as much humiliated by the establishment of republicanism as by the German conquest. The aristocracy has been doubly overthrown, by foreign armies and by the multitude of voters. A French

Victory of Democracy.

Double Defeat of the French Aristocracy.

noble cannot go to any court in Europe without meeting the accredited representative of a *régime* that he abhors, and he cannot enter the French parliament without seeing republicans in office. It is true that the men in office are frequently changed, but the principle that put them there does not change; they are replaced by others not less democratic.

England Free from these Wounds.

England is free from these wounds to her pride. No foreigner occupies any English territory. To have the equivalent of the French patriotic humiliation, five or six English counties would have to be occupied by an enemy, and a huge foreign fortress and arsenal, on English ground, would be constantly threatening London. With regard to internal causes of humiliation for the upper classes, they would feel what the French gentry feel if the monarchy and the House of Lords were abolished, and the Methodist, Baptist, and Jewish religions were established equally with the Church of England. This, then, is the great difference between the English and the French in this matter of national pride. There are existing causes which make that sentiment impossible, for the present, in France; there is no existing cause to prevent it from flourishing in the minds of Englishmen.

Imagined Changes in England.

England the Head of a Family.

The English have a motive for pride which is unknown to their French neighbours. They are the leading nation in a family of nations. They feel superior to the Americans of the United States by antiquity and by priority of civilisation, and they be-

lieve themselves to be their superiors in culture and in manners. Besides these differences, which may be more or less imaginary, it is obvious that aristocratic Englishmen must look down upon American democracy, since they look down, impartially, upon all democracies. The English living in England have a superiority of position over their own colonies, and are surprised to learn from Mr. Froude that a high degree of civilisation is to be found at the Antipodes. There are two opposite ways of thinking about the colonies that give equal aliment to the pride of an Englishman. He may have something like Mrs. Jameson's first impression of Canadian society, as "a small community of fourth-rate half-educated or uneducated people, where local politics of the meanest kind engross the men, and petty gossip and household cares the women," and in that case the superiority of England must be incontestable, or he may adopt the views of Mr. Froude, and then reflect what a great thing it is for England to be the first amongst the highly-civilised English-speaking communities. He is, besides, under no necessity to cross the ocean for subjects of comparison. He feels himself easily superior to the Scotch and Irish, and until recent agitations he had almost forgotten the very existence of the Welsh. All Scotch people know that the English, though they visit Scotland to admire the lochs and enjoy Highland sports, are as ignorant about what is essentially national in that country as if it were a foreign land. Ireland is at least equally foreign to

Feeling towards American Democracy.

Mrs. Jameson's Impression of Canadian Society.

The Englishman's Superiority to the Scotch and Irish.

His Ignorance of Scotland.

them, or was so before the burning question of Home Rule directed attention to Irish affairs. This ignorance is not attributable to dulness. It has but one cause, the pride of national pre-eminence, the pride of being the first amongst the English-speaking nations of the world.

Patriotic pride derives constantly renewed strength from a certain mental habit, which may grow upon a nation as it frequently does upon an individual. A man may get into the habit of despising, he may get into the habit of rating what others possess and what others do at an estimate below the truth. It is an indirect way of exalting without over-estimating himself, and therefore is pleasing to natures that are neither boastful nor vain, yet are firmly tenacious of pre-eminence. Now, although the English are said to be a deferential people, and have, no doubt, the habit of deference for certain distinctions, they are at the same time an eminently contemptuous people, even within the limits of their own island. Their habit of contempt is tranquil, it is without vaunt and without vanity, but it is almost constant, and they dwell with difficulty in that middle or neutral state which neither reverences nor despises. Consequently, when there is not some very special reason for feeling deference towards a foreigner, the Englishman is likely to despise him. The same mental habit causes the English, as a nation, to underrate habitually the strength and intelligence of other nations, without much overrating their own. The common Englishman thinks nothing of the French navy, hardly be-

The Habit of despising.

The English a Contemptuous People.

The English underrate other Nations

lieves that the French can build or manage a ship of war, although the French navy is, in reality, the second in the world, and a good second; but the English do not overrate their own navy, on the contrary, they are very much alive to its deficiencies and defects. The common Englishman under-estimates French wealth, he does not think much of wealth that can be expressed in francs, yet at the same time he does not over-estimate the wealth of England. This tendency to despise others is shown in a peculiarly dangerous way by the English when they go to war. At such times they almost invariably under-estimate the strength of the antagonist and the difficulty of the enterprise, thus imposing needless hardships on the inadequate little force that begins the war.

English do not overrate Themselves.

The habit of despising and under-estimating is shown by the English, not only with regard to other nations, but in face of the natural forces themselves. They are very averse to taking precautions against danger, they have to be forced to it by law, and when the law is made, it is likely to become a dead letter. A notorious instance of this is the eternal inadequacy of the provision for saving life every time a ship founders. It is, in all things, strongly characteristic of Englishmen to apply to every great or little thing they have to do the minimum of necessary effort. This is only another expression of their tendency to despise an opposing force.

English underrate even the Forces of Nature.

The French, on the other hand, are generally less disposed both to the feelings of respect and

French less disposed to

contempt. They look upon the world with an easier indifference, not much respecting anybody or anything, but they are ready enough to acknowledge the merits and qualities of people and things that are not the best. The French are severe critics only where there is great pretension; they regard ordinary, unpretending people and things with a good-humoured indulgence. When there is much pretension, their levelling instinct makes them ready *debellare superbos*. It is a remarkable proof of the substantial strength of Victor Hugo's reputation that a man of such immense vanity, such prodigious pretension, should have been able to get himself taken at his own estimate in France. Napoleon III., although he had at his disposal the theatrical machinery of imperial state, was never able to win any real deference.

Respect and Contempt.

Their Levelling Instinct.

Victor Hugo.

Napoleon III.

If the French are not contemptuous, it may be asked what is their feeling towards other nations, what is the form that national hostility takes in their case? When an Englishman despises, how does a Frenchman express international antagonism? The answer has been already given by Prince Bismarck in a celebrated speech. He said that the French hated their neighbours, that they hated the English and Italians as they hated the Germans. That is an accurate account of French sentiment towards neighbouring countries, except that, for the present, the hatred of the foreigner is more actively directed against Germany. The most trifling international incident is enough to awaken furious animosity in the French press against the English or the Italians.

French Feeling.

Accurately described by Bismarck.

This may be a reason why the French cannot form durable alliances, especially with their neighbours. Their present attempt to ally themselves with Russia may be more fortunate, precisely because Russia is *not* a neighbour.

## CHAPTER III.

### PATRIOTIC JEALOUSY.

Conditions that excite Jealousy.

THE condition of things that most readily produces jealousy between rivals is a near approximation to equality, provided that the equals are very few in number, and that each of them has substantial claims to eminence.

Present in the Case of France and England.

All the necessary conditions unite to produce jealousy between France and England. They have been the two greatest of European nations, they are still the most ancient of the Great Powers, and the most advanced in the arts of civilisation. Their weight and influence in Europe are very nearly the same. Their populations approximate very closely, France, in round numbers, having about thirty-eight inhabitants to thirty-seven in the United Kingdom. As to European territory they are unequal, but the larger home territory of France is compensated by the larger colonial territory of England. Both are great naval Powers. As if to sharpen their feelings of rivalry, the two greatest naval Powers in the world hold the shores of a narrow channel, where each may see the warships of the other. England has a great naval superiority, but she needs it to protect her commerce and her colonies. In like manner the superior military strength of France is occupied

Rivals in Europe.

Rivals in Naval Strength.

Both nominally Powers of the First Class.

in the defence of her land frontier. Both England and France are nominally Powers of the first class, yet neither is exactly so in reality, the proof being that neither the one nor the other dare venture, without an ally, to measure herself against either Germany or Russia. In wealth they are more nearly equal than any other two countries in the world. The system of government, though under different names, is practically the same in both countries, being representative in both, with power in the lower chamber and responsible cabinets. In each of the two countries political liberty is as nearly complete in practice as recent experiments in democracy will permit. In both there is a contest between the aristocracy and the people. An increasingly liberal religious policy in both France and England has led to the equal toleration of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, though in neither country, as yet, is there anything like a social equality of creeds.

Their near Equality in Wealth.

Political Liberty.

Aristocracy and the People.

Religious Policy.

In external matters the resemblance between France and England is equally remarkable. England is an Atlantic power—France has a long Atlantic seaboard. England has stations in the Mediterranean and holds two important islands—France has a Mediterranean coast and holds one important island. Both Powers intervened in Algiers, and France annexed it; both Powers intervened in Egypt, and England occupied it. Both France and England have possessions on the west coast of Africa. In southern Africa the European position of England and France is counterchanged. There England is the continental Power and France (in Madagascar)

Rivalry abroad.

France and England in Africa.

the insular. In most of the great British dependencies and colonies it has been at one time doubtful whether England or France was to be the final occupant; and though the superior colonising genius of England and her prudent European alliances have generally settled the question in her favour, there has been enough of rivalry to leave its mark in history, in the nomenclature of places, and even (in one instance) in the survival of an important French-speaking population. Nor does the world-rivalry of France and England show any sign of coming to an end. Their policy at Constantinople and St. Petersburgh has quite recently been antagonistic. It is steadily antagonistic in Egypt, and although the wisdom of rulers (happily greater than that of populations) has led to an agreement about the Suez Canal and the New Hebrides, there may at any time arise the contention that leads to war. Although France is now incomparably inferior to England as a colonial Power, the English are still as jealous of French influence as if it might ultimately regain Canada and India. The Tonquin and Madagascar expeditions were treated in the English press with a jealousy only equalled by the French newspapers about Egypt, and both enterprises were followed by fresh British annexations in Asia and South Africa. In a word, although French colonising schemes may not, in the present day, be comparable to what England has done and is still doing, they are of sufficient importance to keep alive the ancient sense of rivalry, the undying jealousy of neighbours who have known each other too long and met each other too often.

Rivalry in the East.

English Jealousy of French Colonial Enterprises.

Not to be ended by a War.

The peculiarity of this case is that it cannot be settled by a war, like the old jealousy between Austria and Prussia. Neither of the two Powers feels able to expel the other from her position. I remember that, when the English attacked the Zulu king Cetewayo and broke his power it was maintained in England that a State had the right to break the power of a neighbour if its existence could be considered menacing. How much more, then, would England have a right to break the naval power of France, which is close to her own shores and menaces her own capital, and what an error of policy she commits by tolerating the existence and the increase of the French fleet! Why this long-suffering tenderness of respect for French arsenals? The answer is that England is not so sure of victory in a war with France as she was in the war against Cetewayo.

The Right to break a Neighbour's Strength.

Not applicable against the Strong.

The principle that it is right to break the power of a neighbour is not applied when that power is really formidable. In other words, the more it is desirable that a neighbour's strength should be broken, the less is it likely to be done.

Possession of the Channel Islands.

Now let us consider the question from the French side. The English hold several islands which are very near to the French shore, and the French are vexed by England's possession of these islands. It is not so galling a wound to French pride as the English possession of Gibraltar is to the pride of Spain, still it is a perpetual little sore that irritates Frenchmen when they think of it. They do not trouble their minds about ancient historical considerations. The Queen, for them, is not the Duchess

of Normandy, but the head of the rival Power, and they do not like to see this Power holding insular fortresses like unsinkable warships anchored close to their own shores. Well, this being their state of mind, why do they not annex the Channel Islands and reverse the situation by occupying the Isle of Wight? The answer is that the enterprise is felt to be too formidable. To get Sark it would be necessary to vanquish England, and France does not feel sure of being able to accomplish that.

England not to be readily Overcome.

During the long and bloody rivalry of these two countries in the past it is a wonder that neither of them ever managed to murder the other. The will was certainly not wanting; there was no pity, but it is not easy to murder a great nation. The modern Carthage was to have been effaced, yet she is not effaced. Even in the present day each is unable to annihilate her neighbour. Try to imagine a French General surrounding London with his troops; the idea is inconceivable, one cannot see how he is to get them there. And now try to imagine an English army, without continental allies, surrounding Paris with a ring of iron as the Germans did; this idea is as inconceivable as the other; one cannot see how the English army is to reach Paris. Could it land? And if it landed, could it get as far as Amiens?

The Modern Carthage.

Conquest difficult in both Cases.

I cannot conclude this chapter without frankly admitting that national jealousy is reasonable so long as it confines itself to the truth. It is quite reasonable that the French should want to push the English out of Canada and Egypt, and that the English should wish to sink the French fleet. What is un-

That National Jealousy may be Reasonable.

Jealousy in International Criticisms.

reasonable is for two peoples to depreciate each other in books and newspapers, and blacken each other's private characters because both are formidable in a military or a naval sense. How is it that we hear so much of French immorality, and nothing, or next to nothing, of Italian? How is it that, in France, we have heard so much of English cruelty and barbarity, whilst the accounts of Turkish cruelty were received with the smile of incredulity or the shrug of indifference? Why this so tender French sympathy for the Irish, exaggerating all their woes? Why this wonderful Protestant sympathy in England for the unauthorised religious orders in France? How does it happen that everything which seems to tell against one of the two countries is received with instant credence in the other? The answer to all these questions may be found in the two words at the head of the present chapter.

## CHAPTER IV.

### PATRIOTIC DUTY.

THIS is a more agreeable chapter to write than the two which have preceded it, for the idea of patriotic duty is always ennobling, even when that difficult kind of duty is irregularly practised and imperfectly understood.

If England were a continental Power the sense of patriotic duty would probably be the same with Englishmen that it is with Frenchmen. The insular position of England has given an exceptional character to the national views of duty. Effect of the Insular Position of England.

They are more ideal in England, more practical in France. The Englishman thinks, "If I were called upon to make sacrifices for my country I would certainly make them." No doubt he would, but most Englishmen pass through life without being obliged to make any patriotic sacrifice except the payment of taxes, and the French are taxed still more heavily, even in money. Ideal and Practical Views of Patriotic Duty.

English patriotism may be absolutely relied upon by the Government so far as the sentiment is concerned, and the consequent willingness to accept the burden of practical duty in a time of national calamity; but the danger is that the calamity might be sudden, in which case the efforts of a national English Patriotism Reliable. A Peculiar Danger.

patriotism would be unorganised and the patriots themselves untrained.

The Volunteers.

The sense of this danger produced the volunteer movement, which was excellent as an example and as an exercise of patriotic feeling; but if we compare the English volunteers with any one of the great Continental armies, we see at once that their value is moral rather than material. The militia is less an affair of patriotic sentiment and more of an ordinary military institution. It is a sort of reserve answering in the length of its annual exercises to the French *réserve de l'armée active,* but with this important difference, that the militiamen have not necessarily passed through the regular army, and their officers have not necessarily received a military education. Some men and some officers have these advantages, but only by accident.

The Militia.

Military Opinion.

Neither the militia nor the volunteers are taken seriously by the regular army in England, so that the sentiment of patriotic duty which exists in them does not receive that full encouragement which would be desirable for its maintenance. The English army is a special profession, it is not the nation, and its feelings, though patriotic, are at the same time strictly professional. The regulars look upon the militia and volunteers as professional artists look upon meritorious amateurs, that is to say, at the best with good-natured indulgence, and at the worst with undisguised contempt.

The English Army Professional.

The Old Purchase System.

Under the old purchase system English officers formed a caste, and were looked upon with great respect, not because they were ready to sacrifice

their lives for their country, since the privates were equally ready to do that, and the privates were not respected. Officers in those days were respected for being rich and fashionable, or because they were supposed to be the sons of rich men, and the more expensive the habits of the regiment, the deeper was the sentiment of respect. In a word, it was social distinction that was respected in them. The privates were looked upon as a low caste, and the fact that they might have to die for their country did not suffice to elevate them.*

Social Distinction of Rich Officers.

I well remember the old feeling about the army in France under the Second Empire. It was national in the sense of being raised by conscription, but it was not regarded as national by the people. It was looked upon as an instrument of oppression in the hands of Louis Napoleon. In those days the rich avoided military service by paying substitutes. The common word for that transaction was not "paying" as you pay a servant, but "buying" as one buys a slave. The substitute was considered to have sold himself, and was specially despised, instead of being honoured as a man willing to serve his country, whilst no contempt whatever attached to the rich man who paid money to shirk an unpleasant and dangerous patriotic duty.

Former Feeling about the French Army.

* I regret not to have preserved some letters written to the English newspapers by private soldiers, in which they described how they were avoided by civilians even of the humbler classes. They appear to have felt themselves more despised in uniform than if they had been out of uniform. This is simply because the English people have never witnessed the sufferings undergone by soldiers in time of war.

Present State of French Feeling about the Army.

Amongst the benefits of the Franco-German war, and they have been many, there is not one more happy for France than the healthy revolution in public opinion concerning military service. As almost all Frenchmen have now to serve in one way or another, and as they cannot all be officers, the status of the common soldier has risen. He is not regarded as a mercenary, he is not the guard of a tyrant nor his tool, but a citizen who is paying "the tax of blood" to his mother country, or, in other words, who is doing the most honourable work of his whole life. Whatever he may afterwards accomplish as a private citizen, whatever gold or fame he may win by his industry or talent, he will never do anything with more true dignity in it than that ill-paid work with his regiment. It is nobler to perspire on a dusty road in rough soldier's clothing, with a heavy knapsack and rifle, than to display spotless linen in a carriage. It is higher to groom a war-horse and clean the stirrups or the stable *pour la patrie,* than to be oneself groomed by a hair-dresser. A state of public opinion is conceivable in which the humblest services would be held honourable if they belonged to patriotic duty, and this healthy state of opinion is now establishing itself in France. Nothing can exceed the simple cheerfulness with which military duty is generally accepted. It is not always liked, and it is not always pleasant, but it is borne with unflinching good-humour.

The real Dignity of all Military Service however Humble.

The same change in public opinion which has made the humblest military service honourable, has produced a friendly, almost an affectionate, senti-

ment towards the army. Formerly regarded with distrust, it is now looked upon as the strength and defence of the nation. Nobody now believes that the national forces could be used against civil liberty. The prettiest example of the present state of things was seen at the election of President Carnot. A few hundreds of civilians, unarmed, and who might have been dispersed by one company of soldiers, met in the old palace at Versailles, to elect the Chief of the State. The palace was amply guarded, but only to ensure the independence of the electors. A regiment of cavalry waited to escort the new President to Paris without knowing his name. When he stepped into the carriage that quiet civilian was "Commander of the armies of France by land and sea."

The Army and Presidential Elections.

This absolute unity of sentiment between the military and civil populations is a great compensation for the burden of universal service. Another is the increase of manliness and the improvement of national health. Of the reality of this improvement I cannot entertain a doubt, having myself frequently known young men who had gained greatly in strength and activity by their military service, and who felt and acknowledged the benefit. This is peculiarly valuable in France on account of the too close confinement of youths in the public schools. The universality of military service has been accompanied by a great increase in the number and activity of the gymnastic societies, and it has led to much military drill within the schools themselves. The sons of peasants acquire some education in the

Improvement of National Health by Military Service.

Increase of Gymnastics.

Benefit to Education.

army, which is a valuable instrument for spreading a certain amount of elementary culture, and even more than that, through the regimental libraries. The sons of gentlemen, besides the benefit of physical exercise, are often stimulated, by the hope of promotion, to improve the education they already possess.*

Effect of National Armies on Peace and War.

Before leaving the subject of a national army in France, it may be well to consider its effect on peace and war. Experience proves that national armies are essentially peaceful institutions, *on condition that they are combined with parliamentary government.* Everybody has relations in the national army, consequently it is everybody's desire that unnecessary bloodshed be avoided. Popular French feeling was intensely, and I believe universally, averse to the war in Tonquin; and the sacrifices required for those distant expeditions ruined the political career of a most able minister, Jules Ferry, a man of extraordinary capacity and strength of will. Under free institutions ministers dread personal effacement of this kind, and Ferry's example has had a salutary effect. As it is, the occupation of Tonquin may at any time be abandoned through a refusal of the credits. It is not improbable that with an English national

Possible Con-

* For example, at the time when I am writing these pages, a young gentleman, who is an intimate friend of mine, and who has received a scientific education, is diligently preparing himself to pass an examination for a commission in the artillery next month. Being obliged to serve in the army in any case, and having a right degree of *amour-propre*, he wishes to be an officer, and in a scientific branch of the service.

army there might be a growing objection to the prolonged occupation of India. Even the authoritative monarch of Germany could not, by an imperial caprice, despatch the national army to conquer the Chinese Empire. In France, every imaginable war is unpopular, except the one for the recovery of the lost provinces, and there is no desire to undertake even that patriotic war of deliverance without the certainty of success. Consequences of an English National Army.

The formation of a national army by means of conscription is repugnant to English feeling as an interference with personal liberty, but it is improbable that it can for ever be postponed in the British Empire. If the English should ever find themselves engaged in a contest with a great European Power, without an ally on their side, they would be compelled to adopt the conscription in a hurry, and therefore in the worst possible conditions for success. Unless England is prepared to abandon her European position altogether, and content herself with being the greatest of Colonial Powers, the wiser course would be for her to reorganise her forces on a broadly national basis, whilst there is time to do it at leisure. A national army is one of those evils which appear enormous at a distance, but diminish on a nearer approach. The burden which is borne equally by all is not felt to be intolerable. It may be objected that with the sharper social distinctions in England a gentleman would feel himself degraded by serving in the ranks. The answer to this objection has been already indicated. The patriotic spirit in the nation might be trusted

Conscription repugnant to English Feeling.

Burden of a National Army not Intolerable.

English Social Distinctions.

to form a rational opinion about what is or is not really degrading, if the army were national, and not, as at present, divided into the two jealous classes of professionals and amateurs. Even already a gentleman has no objection to being "full private" in the volunteers. If England were once invaded, and a single English town held by an enemy, all vanities and gentilities would vanish before the nobility of patriotic duty, and a gentleman would feel himself honoured in digging a trench or driving a provision cart.

Vanities and Gentilities.

There is one form of patriotic duty in times of peace which is much better understood and much more generally practised in England than in France. The English are violent in party dissension, but they readily sink their own differences in the consideration of foreign affairs, so that there is, on the whole, a remarkable continuity in the foreign policy of England. In February 1888 Mr. Gladstone gave cordial support in the House of Commons to Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, an incident by no means new in English parliamentary history, and if ever the occasion shall arise when to rally round the Government of the day shall be clearly a patriotic duty, as it was when a conflict with Russia appeared imminent, then all the bitter expressions of political enemies will be forgotten and forgiven, and Tory, Liberal, and Radical will be simply Englishmen.

English Patriotism as regards Foreign Policy.

In France this patriotic union is only seen after war has been actually declared and whilst the conflict is going on. It was, no doubt, shown during the war with Germany, when reactionary noblemen

fought under the orders of Gambetta, whom they inwardly execrated, but in times of peace the conduct of French oppositions is rarely patriotic. The line of policy pursued by the reactionary parties at the present day is simply to discredit the Republic, even at the expense of France. To that end they are always willing to upset every cabinet in order to prove the instability of existing institutions, yet at the same time they must be fully aware that their policy is against all the commercial and foreign interests of the country. The disingenuousness of their conduct is clear when they first join the radicals in upsetting a cabinet and then turn round and say, "How lamentable it is that no cabinet, under the Republic, can last more than a few months!" As this book deals only with the present I need not do more than refer to the alliance between the French reactionists and foreign Powers early in the present century, and to the contentment with which they accepted the defeat that led to the Restoration. I should be sorry to attribute to the reactionists opinions which are made for them by their enemies, but it is not too much to say that some of them prefer the Prussians to the republicans, and look to a civil war without disfavour, in spite of all the horrors that it would inflict upon their country. Nor is this bitter spirit of reckless hate by any means confined to the monarchical parties. Is it possible to imagine anything more completely anti-patriotic than the conduct of the Parisian communards in 1871?

French Oppositions rarely Patriotic in Times of Peace.

Reactionary Disingenuousness.

Unpatriotic Bitterness in France.

The idea of patriotic duty has usually, in the

Hatred and Patriotism.

past, been confounded with the passion of hatred. An Englishman who did not hate the French was considered to be unpatriotic, especially if he objected to useless bloodshed and advocated, whenever possible, a policy of conciliation. A few reasonable beings on both sides of the Channel are now beginning to perceive that it is not always, in reality, the most patriotic policy to waste the treasure of their own country and send their own countrymen to slaughter; for this is what blind hatred always comes to in the end. The objects of a patriotic mind alter with the degree of its enlightenment. In rude and ignorant natures patriotism is hatred of the foreigner; in cultivated and generous natures it is a wise and watchful desire for the happiness and prosperity of one's native land. When vulgar patriotism blusters and is quarrelsome, intelligent patriotism keeps a cool head and cleverly steers the ship. The passion of hatred ought to be kept out of international affairs, as a lawyer keeps it out of legal business, looking only to the interest of his client. The vulgar French are childish enough to hate the English; if the English do not hate them in return, the advantage will be all their own.

Vulgar and enlightened Patriotism.

# PART III.

## POLITICS.

## CHAPTER I.

### REVOLUTION.

THERE is a strong resemblance between the great French and English political movements of modern times, but they differ from each other chronologically, and also in the terms by which they are usually described.

The resemblance is seen at once when we use the terms that are equally applicable to both. The word "Monarchy," for example, is misleading, because it is still used in the case of England, where one man does *not* govern, and where popular representative institutions have irresistibly developed themselves. The word "Republic" is misleading in another way, because it is insidiously associated with communism by the enemies of genuine parliamentary government.

Misleading Use of the Words "Monarchy" and "Republic."

Such being the abusive power of words, it is evident that so long as we use the words "Monarchy" and "Republic" for England and France we convey the idea of a difference that does not really exist, at least with that degree of antagonism and contrast; but if we use the words "Absolutism" and "Liberty," supposing "Absolutism" to mean government by one

The Words "Absolutism" and "Liberty."

person, invested with authority, and "Liberty" to mean national self-government, not anarchy, then we shall much more clearly perceive the resemblance in the political movement of the two countries.

England preceded France.

This being said for the sake of clearness, I need only remind the reader that England preceded France by at least a hundred years in the movement from absolutism to liberty, and that this difference of chronology has exercised a very strong influence on English opinion about French affairs. The English have all along had the advantage of a much riper political experience, and they resemble a mature man who has forgotten the mistakes of his own youth and the violence of his boyish temper, whilst he sees those defects in one who is fifteen years younger than himself.

English Treatment of the French Political Evolution.

During all the difficult time of the French passage from absolutism to liberty, the English had a way of treating the French political evolution which was peculiarly their own. They refused to see anything natural or regular in the remarkable process that was going on before their eyes, and perceived only a series of accidents combined with spasmodic human efforts in one direction or another. They did not discern that, through the accidents and the efforts, a great natural force was acting with real though not always visible constancy, the same force which had abolished absolutism in England itself, and produced the great English experiment in representative government.

W. R. Greg.

I have been struck by a passage in one of Mr. W. R. Greg's well-known Essays in *Enigmas of Life,*

where he speaks with a total absence of sympathy for the growth of free institutions in France, and betrays the curious but common English belief that if somebody had done something which was easy at a particular time, such institutions might have been prevented from taking root in the country.

Quotation from his *Enigmas of Life*.

"In France," Mr. Greg wrote, "as is every year becoming more recognised by all students of her history, the ochlocracy, which is now driving her to seemingly irretrievable downfall, is traceable to the fatal weakness of monarch and ministers alike in February 1848, when a parliamentary demand for a very moderate extension of a very restricted franchise was allowed to become, first a street riot, and then a mob revolution, though ordinary determination and consistency of purpose among the authorities might have prevented it from ever growing beyond the dimensions of a mere police affair, and have crushed it at the outset."

The "Ochlocracy."

This, I should say, is an extremely English way of looking at French affairs. The "ochlocracy" (why not simply have said "popular government"?) is driving France to irretrievable downfall—a result not wholly displeasing to her neighbours—and the democratic development might have been prevented if the *bourgeois* king and his ministers had only shown "ordinary determination." A wiser king than Louis Philippe would, no doubt, have made the change to complete democracy gentler and easier by timely concessions; but the ultimate establishment of democratic institutions was inevitable in any case, and inevitable long before Louis Philippe ascended

Mirabeau's answer to Dreux-Brézé.

his precarious throne.* It was inevitable from the hour when Mirabeau gave his immortal answer to the Marquis de Dreux-Brézé: "Nous sommes ici par la volonté du peuple, et nous n'en sortirons que par la puissance des baïonnettes." From that hour, on the 23d of June 1789, when the "will of the people" was openly recognised in a French parliament as superior to the will of the king, the establishment of what Mr. Greg called an "ochlocracy," in its complete development, was simply a question of time. How much parliamentary institutions have gained strength in a hundred years may be realised by imagining the effect of a royal summons to the Chamber of Deputies at the present day. There would be no need of a Mirabeau to resist and resent it with indignant eloquence of voice and gesture; at the most, it would excite a smile.

Resemblance in the Political Metamorphosis of England and France.

For myself, I am much more struck by the resemblance than by the difference between England and France in the great political metamorphosis that has come over both countries and is not yet quite completed in either. I see a wonderful resemblance in the course of events, in the evolution of opinion, and in those general tendencies which are far more important than any mere historical accidents, but I see at the same time a great difference in dates and most curious inequalities of pace. The comparison may be made clearer by supposing that two authors are at work upon two books. The elder has begun

* The throne of Louis Philippe was itself a democratic institution.

his manuscript much sooner than the other, but he has not gone on with it very quickly, except at odd times of inspiration. The younger seems to have plagiarised his opening chapters from his predecessor, there are so many striking points of likeness, but after a time he goes on in his own way and works the faster of the two, notwithstanding frequent goings back caused by immense erasures. Just now it seems as if he had left the elder writer behind, but their different ways of work make this very difficult to determine. Neither of the books is as yet completed. As they advance, their general similarity of tendency and purpose becomes every day more manifest. This vexes the rival authors, who would have preferred to find themselves original.

A Comparison with Authorship.

English critics usually take France during her revolutionary period and compare her with England at another stage when she has got through her revolutionary and is in her reforming period. A more just comparison would be to take England between 1630 and 1730, and France between 1780 and 1880. There are so many points of resemblance between the two that history has almost repeated itself. Our ancestors decapitated a king and the French decapitated theirs; the difference being that the axe was used in one case, and a more ingenious mechanical contrivance in the other. After the execution of Charles I., the English were not yet ripe for liberty, so they fell under the dictatorship of a soldier; the French did exactly the same. When the English were not disposed to endure the Stuarts any longer, they sent them across the Channel.

England from 1630 to 1730, and France from 1780 to 1880.

When the French were not disposed to endure the Bourbons any longer, they sent them across the Channel. The constant tendency in both countries has been to increase the power of the representative chamber and diminish that of the nominal head of the State, with this final result: that in France the National Assembly (the two chambers meeting as one) is declared to be sovereign, and in England the Marquis of Hartington has openly attributed sovereignty to the House of Commons, quoting Professor Dicey in reply to an old-fashioned member who stood aghast at what seemed to him an almost treasonable employment of the word*.

Sovereignty of the French National Assembly.

Sovereignty of the House of Commons.

Difference between France and England in the Intermediate Stage.

There is, however, one very real and essential difference between the English and the French progress towards democracy. The point of departure is the same, the sovereignty of the king; the point of arrival is the same, the sovereignty of the people;

* For the reader's convenience I quote four passages from Dicey on the sovereignty in England. The references are to the first English edition.

"If the true ruler or political sovereign of England were, as was once the case, the King, legislation might be carried out in accordance with the King's will by one of two methods."—*The Law of the Constitution*, p. 354.

"Parliament is, from a merely legal point of view, the absolute sovereign of the British Empire."—*Ibid.*

"The electorate is, in fact, the sovereign of England. It is a body which does not, and from its nature hardly can, itself legislate, and which, owing chiefly to historical causes, has left in existence a theoretically supreme legislature."—*Ibid.*, p. 355.

"Our modern mode of constitutional morality secures, though in a roundabout way, what is called abroad 'the sovereignty of the people.' "—*Ibid.*

but the intermediate stage is not the same. Thanks to the strength of her aristocracy, and especially to its fine energy and spirit, England has been able to pass through a highly convenient intermediate stage, that of an aristocratic republic preserving monarchical appearances. France has not been able to do this, though she tried the experiment in imitation of England, the reason for her inevitable failure being that she had not the kind and quality of aristocracy that was necessary for such a work. In all very disturbing changes there is nothing so convenient, nothing so conducive to prudent deliberation, as a shelter whilst the change is going on. If you destroy your old house to build a new one on its site, you will be glad to hire a temporary residence in the neighbourhood. The English were most fortunate in this, that they had a fine, substantial-looking mansion to retire to, a dignified building that looked as if it would last for ever; the French were out in the cold, and had to dwell in tents, by which I mean their temporary written constitutions.

The English Aristocratic Republic.

Value of Shelter in Times of Change.

The French dwelt in Tents.

The transaction to democratic government was not easy in an old country like France, where the monarchy, in such comparatively recent times as those of Louis XIV., had been the strongest and most splendid monarchy in the world, the realisation of that ideal monarchy in which the king is not simply a figure-head, but a governor whom all in his realm obey, they being his real, not nominal, *subjects*, thrown under his feet by a destiny outside of choice. Neither was Louis XIV. simply a governor; he was

The Ideal Monarchy.

at the same time a kind of demigod, who dwelt in the midst of a ceremonious cultus whereof he was the centre and the object. And although this great prince had degraded the nobility into courtiers, the noble class was still a numerous and a coherent caste which had to be pulverised by democratic legislation before the democratic principle could be finally established. Surely it is not surprising that every step in advance should have been followed by a reaction. Restorations, periods of lassitude, experiments, mistakes—all these were the natural concomitants of a transition for which French history shows no precedent; yet so long as the transition was actually in progress how few Englishmen understood it—how few of them perceived that the modern democratic idea was always, in spite of appearances, steadily making its way!

The old French Noble Caste.

Irregular Nature of French Progress.

Difference between the English and French Revolutions.

The English revolution has differed from the French in one important particular. The English have no written constitutions, and therefore they do not violate them, there being nothing, in fact, to violate. Although the change of dynasty was made openly, and the Protestant succession established, it has been possible for another revolution to take place in complete obscurity, a revolution far more radical than any change of dynasty, and of far greater political importance than the religion of the king. The reader knows that I am alluding to the establishment of cabinet government. This the greatest of all revolutions, has accomplished itself so insidiously that nobody can tell the date of it. French

Establishment of Cabinet Government.

revolutionary dates are all perfectly well known, but this momentous English date is a mystery even to the English.

Copied by France.

What gives especial importance to the English system of cabinet government is that it has been exactly copied by France. The United States of America have a system of their own, presidential government, that the French entirely overlooked when they made their present constitution, though some of the more thoughtful amongst them now regret that it was not adopted in preference to the English.* In France, as in England, the Lower House elects the cabinet by overthrowing every cabinet that does not happen to please it, and a French cabinet, like an English one, lives a precarious life, dependent either upon its representation of the ideas most prevalent in the Chamber, or else on servile submission to its will. Such is the delusive effect of words, that the use of the words "Republic," "President," "Senate," makes unthinking people believe that the French have adopted the American system rather than the English. There is only one essential difference between England and France, and that has been quite recently discovered. The French deputies have found out a way of making the president retire by declining to accept

Precarious Existence of French Cabinets.

Delusive Effect of Words.

New Way of enforcing a President's Retirement.

* The American system would not have succeeded in France. If the president had exercised the authority of an American president the Chamber would not have endured it, and there would have been a presidential crisis, with a new presidential election, every six months. The present system is not ideally perfect, but it suits the French temper better than any other that modern ingenuity can devise.

cabinet offices under him, and in case of real or seeming necessity this method will certainly be resorted to again. On the other hand, no human being can foresee by what method an English House of Commons would compel an unpopular Sovereign to abdicate.*

Peaceful Changes of Persons.

The compulsory retirement of President Grévy and the peaceful election of his successor have completed the modern French system of *making all changes of persons possible without violence.* This is perhaps the best guarantee for internal tranquillity, especially in a country like France, where political reputations are soon used up and services almost immediately forgotten. It is also, in its far-reaching consequences, the most important ultimate result of the French Revolution.

* It may be answered that this could be done by refusing to vote the supplies, but if the Sovereign were perfectly obstinate the House of Commons could not long put a stop to the working of the public service.

## CHAPTER II.

### LIBERTY.

"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity."

Of the three words, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," an Englishman usually accepts the first as a noble aim for nations, whilst he smiles at the two others.*

"Liberty" is a sacred word in England, its birthplace and its home. We all know what we mean by it, and I need not attempt a definition, still it may be well for us to think how it is that the English all believe themselves to be free, whilst in France it is only the republicans who think that of themselves. The monarchists, still a large and influential body, believe themselves to be all victims of oppression.

French Republicans only Free.

The answer may be given in a brief sentence. The English believe themselves to be free, simply because they have got into the habit of accepting the decision of a majority in the House of Commons, even when it is against themselves. The decision is always accepted, though frequently with the intention of getting it reversed at a future date.

Reason for the Difference in sense of Freedom between England and France.

The French reactionary classes have not this

* It is an English habit to represent *égalité* as an Utopian aspiration for equality in all things. The French understand it to mean nothing more than equality before the law.

feeling of respect for the decisions of the Chamber of Deputies. They have not got into the habit of it, perhaps they never will, and they chafe under every adverse decision, which seems to them a distinct act of tyranny.

Nothing Sacred in a Majority.

"There is nothing sacred in a majority," they say. To this an Englishman can only answer that in the working of free institutions it has been found a convenience to accept the decisions of majorities, at least provisionally.

The French reactionaries have neither acquired this habit nor are they likely to acquire it, so the feeling of being oppressed must remain with them, particularly as they are not likely to procure the abolition of universal suffrage.

A Resemblance between France and England.

A resemblance between France and England is much more likely to be brought about in another way. Considerable numbers of people in the English upper classes are already feeling a hatred for Mr. Gladstone comparable in intensity to that which their French equals had for Gambetta. Mr. Gladstone himself gave the signal for combat by opposing "the masses" to "the classes" in words that will be long remembered. Mr. Morley said of the House of Lords that it must be "either mended or ended," and that expression also is one not likely to be forgotten. Now if we suppose the case, not absolutely impossible, of these two democratic English leaders, at the head of a strong majority in the House of Commons, legislating in the sense indicated broadly and generally by the expressions just quoted, would the English "classes" have a heartfelt respect for

Mr. Gladstone.

Effects of a Contest of Classes.

the new laws? Judging by present signs of the times, it seems by no means unlikely that the sentiments of a defeated English upper-class minority would resemble those of the same defeated class in France. A contest of classes is a bitter contest, and England, as yet, has had but a slight experience of it. How much the Irish question has become, in England, a class question, may be seen by the frank acknowledgment of Mr. Gladstone that "the classes" are against him. Besides the majority in the House of Commons which is against Home rule (in the present year, 1888), Mr. Gladstone enumerates as its opponents "nine-tenths of the House of Lords; nine-tenths at least of what is termed the wealth of the country and of the vast forces of social influence, an overwhelming share (in its own estimation) of British intellect, and undoubtedly an enormous proportion of those who have received an academical education in England"* If Mr. Gladstone hopes to overcome these great social powers, it can only be by the popular vote; and if he conquers by that means, then he will have established the state of things which exists in France, where the upper classes are overborne by numbers. It is easy to apply Mr. Gladstone's own phrases, with a slight change, quite truly to the French. "Nine-tenths of the nobility, nine-tenths at least of what is called the wealth of the country, and of the vast forces of social influence, an overwhelming share (in its own estimation) of French intellect, and undoubtedly an

The Irish Question a Class Question.

Powerful Social Opposition to Mr. Gladstone.

French Upper Classes overborne by Numbers.

* Article in the *Contemporary Review* for March 1888.

enormous proportion of those who have received a clerical education"* are hostile to the Republic in France. And what in consequence? The consequence is that these classes entirely deny the existence of liberty in that country, although voting is perfectly free, and laws are always passed by a majority.

The "Classes" deny the Existence of "Liberty" in France.

A close study of French feeling (and of English feeling as it is gradually assimilating itself to French) has led me to the following conclusion: *Government by majority is considered to be a state of liberty only so long as opposing forces are so nearly balanced that the minority of to-day may hope to become the majority of to-morrow.* A minority lives on hope, when it has no hope it becomes bitter and considers itself the victim of tyranny. To understand English liberty as it flourished in the last generation, we must remember that it meant for the "classes" the kind of liberty a gentleman and his wife enjoy in their own house. They may have disputes between themselves, sometimes one has the upper hand and sometimes the other, but whichever rules for the day there is no insubordination amongst the domestics, and, if there were, the two would unite to repress it.

Minorities live on Hope.

English Liberty in the last Generation.

In a word, by "liberty" people really understand liberty to govern others. The most conspicuous example of this interpretation is given by Leo XIII.,

Liberty to govern Others. Liberty according to Leo XIII.

* The reader will observe that I have substituted "nobility" for "House of Lords," as there is no House of Lords in France, and "clerical" for "academical" education, as there is nothing corresponding to Oxford and Cambridge.

who says that he can enjoy no sense of freedom in Rome until he is permitted to govern all the other inhabitants of the city.

Whether it can be called "liberty" or not, the kind of government which has succeeded in establishing itself in England and France is exactly the same in both countries. It is cameral government, the rule of a single chamber, the most modern form of absolutism, especially when the chamber delegates all its power to one man. The French Chamber has been so clearly aware of the power such a man would wield that it has shown an extreme jealousy of personal government ever since MacMahon's unsuccessful experiment. It would not permit even Gambetta to become a potentate. It perceived the fine governing faculties of Jules Ferry and put him aside. Nobody with a despotic temper has a chance of remaining prime minister. The meddling disposition of Wilson was supposed to be creating an occult personal power at the Elysée, so he was expelled from that palace, even though his expulsion involved that of a good president. The same jealousy of personal power removed General Boulanger from the War Office. The longer cameral government lasts in France, the more evident it becomes that the Chamber means to have its way in everything and to suppress all inconvenient individualities.

Cameral Government. The most Modern Form of Absolutism.

French Jealousy of born Rulers.

Opposition of the French Chamber to Individualities.

We have not to go far back in English history to observe the same tendency in the House of Commons. The English Chamber has dealt with Mr. Gladstone in the French fashion. The dissentient Liberals caused his downfall with no more regard

for his splendid reputation than if they had been so many French deputies. They had, no doubt, a perfect right to act independently, but it was an assertion of the power of numbers in the House of Commons against the authority of genius and renown.

Numbers *versus* Genius in the House of Commons.

"In spite of appearances," said Mr. Frederic Harrison on the 1st of January 1886, "and conventional formulas, habits, and fictions to the contrary, the House of Commons represents the most absolute autocracy ever set up by a great nation since the French Revolution. Government here is now merely a committee of that huge democratic club, the House of Commons, without any of the reserves of power in other parts of the constitution which are to be found in the constitutions of France and the United States."

Mr. Frederic Harrison on the Autocracy of the House.

America lies outside of our present subject, but with regard to France there is little to be said for "the reserves of power in other parts of the constitution." They look very reassuring on paper, in reality their effect is feeble. It is plain that President Grévy had the clearest right to stay at his post, and he had no desire to abandon it. He had been guilty of no crime or misdemeanour, he had been invested with authority for seven years. What was that authority worth when it came to a contest with the Chamber? Dissolution? The senate dared not help him to dissolve. When that saddened and broken old man followed his luggage out of the courtyard of the Elysée the world knew that there was only one real power in France.

Small Practical Value of Paper Guarantees.

Only one real Power in France.

The inference from these events in the two

countries is that the tendency of this new thing, cameral government, may at first be to create a powerful despot with the support of the chamber, but that after longer experience an elected chamber will become wary and keep very much on its guard against eminent persons, however eloquent, and will be jealous of them and keep them down. This watchful jealousy in a chamber may turn out to be the best of all safeguards for national liberty—it saved France from the authority of Gambetta, a man of a most despotic disposition—but it is unfavourable to an *esprit de suite* in policy or to a vigorous policy of any kind, either at home or abroad, as we may all see by the ephemeral French cabinets, in which mediocrity and obscurity appear to be positive recommendations.

Cameral Jealousy a Safeguard of Liberty.

But unfavourable to vigorous Policy.

Political liberty is seldom without some kind of effect on religious liberty. A political revolution may be associated with a religious change in one of two ways. It may proclaim the right to real liberty of thought, or it may substitute a new orthodoxy for an old one. The first was done in France in 1789 by the Declaration of the Rights of Man; the second was done twice over in England—once by erecting a new Anglican orthodoxy, and a second time by erecting a new Puritan orthodoxy, the ultimate effect of the last being the establishment of religious freedom for various classes of Protestant dissenters, but not for unbelievers. "The denial of the truth of Christianity," says Professor Dicey, "or of the authority of the Scriptures by 'writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking,' on the part of any

Effect of Political on Religious Liberty. Political Revolution and Religious Change. In France.

In England.

Incomplete Character of Religious Liberty in England.

person who has been educated in or made profession of Christianity in England, is by statute a criminal offence, entailing very severe penalties. When once, however, the principles of the common law and the force of the enactments still contained in the statute-book are really appreciated, no one can maintain that the law of England recognises anything like that natural right to the free communication of thoughts and opinions which was proclaimed in France nearly a hundred years ago to be one of the most valuable Rights of Man. . . . Freedom of discussion is, in England, little else than the right to write or say anything which a jury, consisting of twelve shopkeepers, think it expedient should be said or written. Such liberty may vary at different times and seasons from unrestricted license to very severe restraint."

Freedom of Discussion in England.

## CHAPTER III.

### CONSERVATISM.

No country can be more favourable than France for the observation of that process by which a startling novelty is taken after a short time under the protection of the most sober conservative feeling.

Novelties adopted by Conservative Feeling.

France is at the same time willing to make hazardous experiments, and yet extremely conservative by natural disposition. The consequence of these two apparently opposite tendencies in the same nation is that the results of successful experiments are preserved for continuous practical application, and the rest very soon discarded and forgotten. Sometimes an experiment has been partially successful and is thought to have failed temporarily, not from any want of applicability in the idea itself, but owing to unfavourable circumstances. In such cases the experiment is not likely to be lost. It will be tried again, at least once, or more than once.

France both Experimental and Conservative.

Partially Successful Experiments.

The two tendencies, experimental and conservative, have both been manifested many times in French constitutions. How many there have been of them I cannot inform the reader. Dicey gives a minimum of sixteen; there may have been more. The number of them is of no importance; the state

Experimental and Conservative Tendencies in French Constitutions.

of mind that produced them is alone of any real importance.

The Love of Change not the Motive for making written Constitutions.

It has commonly been assumed that a state of mind which could produce so many constitutions was animated by the love of change. This is exactly the opposite of the truth. Those who love change on its own account provide for it by the most elastic arrangements in order to leave everything open. The state of feeling that induces men to bind themselves, or try to bind themselves, by written rules for their future guidance is a desire for order and permanence. All that can be truly said against the French experimenters is that their hopes of orderly arrangements were premature. Even when producing disorder they have been lovers of order and desired it, though during many years, in the eagerness of inexperience, they failed to perceive that their political life was still too much unsettled to be cast into fixed forms. At last, without abandoning the safeguard of a written constitution (that of 1875 has already a respectable antiquity), they have provided for future changes by making revision possible under conditions that have hitherto completely assured the maintenance of order.

The Desire for Order and Permanence.

Premature Hopes of Order.

Revision.

Sir Henry Maine on the Dislike to Change.

The reader perhaps remembers how eloquently Sir Henry Maine described the dislike to change which is inherent in large bodies of mankind. "Vast populations, some of them with a civilisation considerable but peculiar, detest that which in the west would be called reform. The entire Mohammedan world detests it. The multitude of coloured men who swarm in the great continent of Africa detest

The Mohammedan World.

Africa.

it, and it is detested by that large part of mankind which we are accustomed to leave on one side as barbarous or savage. The millions upon millions of men who fill the Chinese empire loathe it and (what is more) despise it. . . . There is not the shadow of a doubt that the enormous mass of the Indian population hates and dreads change, as is natural in the parts of a body-social solidified by caste." * China.

Sir Henry Maine afterwards pointed out that the enthusiasm for change was not only comparatively rare but also extremely modern. "It is known but to a small part of mankind, and to that part but for a short period during a history of incalculable length. It is not older than the free employment of legislation by popular governments." Modern Character of the Enthusiasm for Change.

The intention of the passages quoted is to depreciate the love of reform in modern life, and is therefore unfriendly to popular government as we know it, but this unfriendly intention does not deprive the quotations of their truth. All that, and much more written by the same author on that subject, is strictly true. He went on to point to the intense and universal conservatism of women, "in all communities the strictest conservators of usage and the sternest censors of departure from accepted rules of morals, manners, and fashions." Universal Conservatism of Women.

This constant strength of conservative instinct is not counterbalanced by any equivalent reforming in- Rarity of the Reforming Impulses.

* *Popular Government*, Essay III.

stinct. It is not our hereditary habit of mind that leads us to reform, but our occasional fits of reasoning and of intellectual unrest.

French Tendency to a Democratic Conservatism.

My belief about the French is that their real tendency is decidedly not revolutionary but towards a democratic conservatism, and that they move towards this end by gradually including first one thing and then another in the catalogue of fixed usages. This belief has been strongly confirmed by the elections of 1889.

A French Theory of ultimate Civilisations.

An intelligent French writer has maintained that every race in the world advances towards a certain ultimate civilisation which is naturally its own, and that when this civilisation is attained there may be an end to change for centuries, or even, as in China, for thousands of years. He believed that France was rapidly approaching the complete development of that peculiar kind of civilisation for which the French genius is fitted, and might afterwards enter upon a changeless time of very long duration.

France thought to be approaching her Complete Development.

Example of the Decimal Systems.

The decimal system of weights and measures and the decimal coinage are good examples of a recent innovation established at first by law and already protected by conservative usage. I never met with a Frenchman who desired to go back to the old complicated system; indeed the facility of calculation by the decimal method has spoiled the French for any other. I see no reason why the present decimal systems should not endure with French civilisation. They are exactly in accordance with the scientific turn of the race, and with its

love of promptitude, clearness, rapidity, and uniformity. *

Division of France into Departments.

Then there is the division of the country into departments. The old historical provinces were too large for administrative purposes, the departments are highly convenient. Being named after the natural features of the country, they at once convey to the mind an idea of their situation in physical geography. The division could not have been better done; it has now become as familiar to the French as division by counties is to the English, and the two may be equally durable.

The System of Departmental Administration.

The same may be said of the highly-organised and extremely convenient system of departmental administration. It has survived several great changes of government, and is likely to outlive any others that may occur in the future. Some slight modifications may be introduced, such as the suppression of useless sub-prefectures.

The French University likely to last.

The French University, which has schools in every department of France, and academic examining bodies in seventeen (including Algeria), is one of those institutions of Napoleon I. which seem likely to last with his code. It answers to the desire in the middle classes for a widely-spread Latin and

* An English critic once said that the decimal monetary system had not yet been accepted by the French people because they counted in sous. They do not invariably count in sous, but they often do, and that without being unfaithful to the decimal principle, as may be seen by the following table:—

The five-franc piece = 100 sous.
The half-franc piece = 10 sous.
The one-sou piece = 1 sou.

mathematical education. This education may be modified in future years without destroying the University.

Probable Permanent Character of Universal Suffrage.

Universal suffrage has always been so difficult to abolish that nobody has attempted it, though no institution can be more cordially detested by some influential classes. The universality of military service has greatly increased the strength of universal suffrage, as every man may be called upon to die for the country, and therefore thinks that he has a natural right to vote. We are familiar with the phrase "a stake in the country." Every Frenchman has at least one stake in the country—his life. There is not the most remote probability that universal suffrage will ever be repealed.

Probable Permanence of Representative Government.

Many quite sober-minded and thoughtful Frenchmen are now of opinion that representative government, after several unsuccessful attempts, is firmly and finally established in their country. I dare hardly go so far as to assert so much, but I am fully convinced that, if not now, it will be ultimately the fixed form of government in France.

Abandonment of the Republican Calendar.

As an example of a reform which has *not* been preserved I may mention the republican calendar. It was both beautiful and rational in its observation of nature, and was certainly an improvement upon the old calendar in the choice of names, but it fell into disuse from its inconvenience. It was only national and not international as a calendar ought to be. In times like these, when the French decimal coinage is already an international system, it would be a reactionary measure to go back to a national calendar.

A Calendar ought to be International.

It will only be revived if several other nations agree to use it at the same time, which is not likely to happen.

In England it is easy to point to several institutions, once quite new and having the character of innovations, which the spirit of conservatism immediately adopted and has since defended quite as resolutely as if they were of immemorial antiquity. The most wonderful of these is the Church of England. The more one learns of the temper of aristocracies, the more astonishing it seems that a great aristocracy can ever have changed the outward form of its religion. Try to imagine the French *noblesse* becoming "evangelical," or think in our own day of the utter hopelessness of any project for converting the English gentry to Wesleyan Methodism! Such transformations are unthinkable, yet the fact remains that the English nobility and gentry did once go over *en masse* to the new communion, and that they have been as conservative of it ever since as if it were still the faith of their ancestors. Anglicanism is every whit as strong in England as the older Church is in France, though Roman Catholicism is a natural growth formed by the evolution of the religious sentiment through ages. The strength of Anglicanism as a social and political institution is proved by nothing more clearly than this, that in our own day, in many individual cases, it actually outlives Christianity. I mean that in these cases all dogma is rejected or explained away, whilst the Anglican name and customs are preserved.

The Church of England.

Wonderful Change that led to its Establishment.

The Strength of Anglicanism.

Catholic Emancipation was most vigorously re-

Catholic Emancipation.

sented by English conservative sentiment in the third decade of the present century. In its ninth decade not only are Catholics on a footing of political equality with their fellow-subjects, but their superior clergy are treated with a deference and a consideration never given to Protestant Dissenters. The most venerated ecclesiastic in England is a Cardinal.

English Conservative Sympathy with French Catholics.

Whenever the Catholic party in France is in conflict with the State it is sure of conservative sympathy in England.* Any attempt to replace Catholics under the ban would now be resented by the upper classes.

The Revolutionary Monarchy.

The revolutionary monarchy has now been so loyally adopted in England that we only remember its revolutionary origin when historical students remind us of it. For the common people, especially

Revival of Divine Right.

for the religious, Her Majesty reigns by divine right. There seems to be a shade of impiety and even a perceptible odour of treason in the crude assertion that she reigns simply by Act of Parliament.

Permanent Nature of Popular Gains.

On the other hand, popular claims that were once violently resisted assume, when they have been admitted, the character of indefeasible rights. Every extension of the suffrage is a popular gain, not for a time only, but for ever. Every gain made by the friends of religious toleration, and by those who work in hope for a future condition of religious equality, is a sure and permanent gain. There is a great deal

* The word "conservative" is not used in this place with reference to the Tory party alone. There is much conservative sentiment in other parties.

of conservatism in England, there is little or no reaction. Indeed, the words "reaction" and "reactionary" are scarcely English words at all in a political sense; they are French words. No Englishman ever has that spiteful hatred of the present which distinguishes the French *réactionnaire*. Little Reaction in England.

There is a species of conservatism both in England and France which is maintained by mutual antipathy. Each country clings desperately to its old ways when a better way has been shown by the other, and if one of them feels compelled, at last, to follow the other's example, the utmost care is taken to disguise the imitation, so that it may not seem to be an acknowledgment of superiority. The reader may remember how unwillingly Thiers admitted the merits of railways, how he visited the north of England to see and try them, and how he reported unfavourably to his government, saying that railways might answer for England, but could never be suitable to France. The parallel instance is the well-known English unbelief in the Suez Canal, a French undertaking. The Conservatism of Antipathy. Thiers and Railways. England and the Suez Canal.

Here are two other examples, the English unwillingness to accept the French decimal systems, because they are French, and the unwillingness, on the other side of the Channel, to take the British penny postage stamp as it was. The English monetary system is inconvenient, but it is not intolerable, and may be retained for centuries; the system (or chaos) of weights and measures is incoherent and intolerable. Few Englishmen could part with the English Opposition to French Decimal Systems. Intolerable English System of Weights and Measures.

pound sterling without a pang, but surely it need not cost them much sorrow to see the extinction of the pound troy, which is two hundred and forty penny-weights, of the pound avoirdupois, which is two hundred and fifty-six drams, and of the apothecaries' pound, which is two hundred and eighty-eight scruples. The objection to the metrical system is not absolute, the English are coming to it slowly, it is already legal, and men of science have long since adopted it. The French objection to the penny post is gradually giving way to the desire for increased cheapness, and now the letter has got down to three sous; but why this reluctance, on both sides, to adopt the neighbour's good invention in its simplicity?*

French Objection to the Penny Post.

France and England do gradually learn from each other against their will. The consequence is that their political habits are slowly assimilating. The English have adopted the closure, and are tending towards earlier parliamentary sittings. In

Slow Assimilation of France and England.

* Even if the English did ultimately adopt the French weights and measures, without the coinage, they would not enjoy the full convenience of those systems, which consists in great part in their *relation* to the coinage. For example, in English land measure (what is called "square measure") you have 160 poles to the acre. A farmer takes an acre at thirty-seven shillings, how much is that per pole? I do not know; I must make an elaborate calculation to find it out. A French farmer takes a *hectare* at sixty-seven francs, how much is that per *are?* Owing to the *intentional relation between measures and money*, the answer comes instantaneously, without calculation, sixty-seven centimes.

elections they have accepted the French system of secret voting, and in course of time they will accept the French principle of "one man, one vote." In 1888 the English at last adopted the French *Conseils Généraux*.

## CHAPTER IV.

### STABILITY.

Reactionary French Ideas about English Stability.

It is customary with the reactionary parties in France to look to England as the model of everything that is stable; and as their ignorance of English affairs prevents them from seeing what is going on beneath the surface, they conclude that what they believe to be the British constitution is invested with indefinite durability, whilst the French republican constitution is always about to perish.

Old Institutions provoke Change.

In calculating thus, the French reactionists omit one consideration of immense importance. They fail to see that the very presence of old institutions, unless they are so perfectly adapted to modern wants as to make people forget that they are old, is in itself a provocative to the spirit of change, and that it excites a desire for novelty which remains unappeased so long as the old institutions last. The old thing quickens the impulse to modernise when something not old enough to attract attention by its antiquity would have left that special and peculiar passion unawakened.

Mediæval Buildings.

As an example of this, I may mention the existence of mediæval buildings in the streets of a town. Such buildings act as a powerful stimulus to

the destructive tendencies of modern municipalities. French cities formerly abounded in such old buildings, but the municipalities cleared most of them away, and it became necessary to restrain this destructive instinct by the enactment of a law for the protection of all buildings classed as "historical monuments."

"Historical Monuments."

In like manner the presence of the State Church in England, of the hereditary legislating peers, and of the royal family, as well as of many other ancient things of minor importance, is a stimulus to the spirit of change in radical politicians. It sounds paradoxical, but it is true, that the conservative House of Lords is an obstacle to the final establishment of a conservative spirit in the people. Great numbers of the English electors and many of their representatives are animated by the same tendency to destroy and reconstruct which used to be very active in France.

Anti-Conservative Effect of the House of Lords.

It does not require any special clearness of vision to perceive that, so far from having closed the era of great changes, Great Britain and Ireland have only entered upon it. Their future for many years, perhaps for an entire century, is destined to be a future of change,—of change desired eagerly by some, resisted with all the strength of self-protecting instinct by many others, admitted to be inevitable by the wise, who will be anxious only to direct and control it wisely. It will be a time of uncertainty and unrest, of new political combinations, and very probably of ephemeral cabinets. The tendency to instability in cabinets was already manifest before the coalition which enabled Lord Salisbury's govern-

A Future of Change for Great Britain.

Instability in English Cabinets.

ment to live.* The well-known difficulty in finding support for any government in France was beginning to show itself very plainly in England also. Except on a single question, the House of Commons will no longer conveniently divide itself into two parties, after the old English fashion, but splits into three or four, almost like the French Chamber.

Division into two Parties at an End.

The condition of instability which already exists in England, was strikingly illustrated in the year 1886 by a chance vote in the House of Commons. Mr. Labouchere had so powerful a minority in favour of his resolution against the hereditary principle in the other House, that a sign from Mr. Gladstone would have immediately converted it into a majority, and Mr. Gladstone's support of the resolution was refused in terms scarcely more consolatory for hereditary legislators than those of the resolution itself. The House did not listen to Mr. Labouchere's speech with indignation, but with amusement, and the only incident of any solemnity was the exclamation of a member who cried out "The Writing on the Wall!" when the formidable minority was made known. Now, although the English have not any written constitution, all foreigners have hitherto been accustomed to believe in the dignity and permanence of the House of Lords, and they have believed it to be a part of that great reality which was called *La Constitution Anglaise*. How is it possible to retain these

Labouchere's Resolution against the Hereditary Principle, 1886.

"The Writing on the Wall."

* M. de Freycinet, at the time when he was Foreign Minister in France, expressed a feeling of regret, that owing to the instability of English cabinets, it was not easy to carry on protracted negotiations.—*Speech of the 27th of November* 1886.

old belief after such a parliamentary incident as this?

Stability of Established Churches. Difficulty of Tolerance in a State Church.

The question of stability as it affects established Churches will be dealt with in the chapters on Religion. The true cause of the instability of Anglicanism is not religious, but social. A State Church can hardly afford to be tolerant; the necessities of her position require her to repress Dissent with the strong hand, as the dominant Churches both in England and France have done in other ages. If a State Church has no longer the strength to persecute efficaciously, free religious communities will grow up around her, and in course of time they will claim equality. They have got it in France by co-establishment, which postpones the final separation; but in England there is not co-establishment, and it is too late to think of that expedient, as some well-intentioned men are now doing. The Dissenters dislike being treated as inferiors; they are weary of being put "under the ban." I remember reading a letter from a Dissenter who had visited America, describing the novel and delightful sensation of being in a country where he was not not "under the ban" on account of his religious opinions, and his sensations on returning to England, where, as a Dissenter, he felt at every step that he was placed in an inferior caste. In France the sacerdotal power owes its present instability and precariousness of tenure to its essentially political character. In both countries the real and genuine religious hatred which belonged to the old spirit of enmity between Catholic and

Dislike felt by Dissenters to being treated as Inferiors.

Protestant has given place to a newer and less virulent kind of antagonism.

Preference of Utility to Dignity.

The essential character of all modern political change is the preference of utility to dignity, and consequently of useful institutions to august institutions. At the present time (1888) there are many more august institutions in England than in France. Not only have we the monarchy and the House of Peers, but there are still the old romantic orders of knighthood, including the Garter, which is the most august order in the world, and the least democratic. In France such institutions have been replaced by the Presidency of the Republic, the Senate, and the Legion of Honour, all much less august than the throne of Saint Louis, the Peers of France, and the Order of the Holy Ghost. The change is something like that from pope and cardinals to an evangelical consistory.

More August Institutions in England than in France.

Will England herself retain eternally what remains to her of the august dignities of the past? It is now believed that the State Church and the House of Lords are both institutions of doubtful durability. Is the throne itself secure from that destructive spirit which is threatening them?

Security of the English Throne.

The truest answer may be that the fate of the throne depends far more on the qualities of a single individual than does the fate of the other august English institutions. A very good, wise, and prudent king would make the throne last during a long reign; a bad, incompetent, foolish king would certainly unsettle and perhaps overturn it. In the nineteenth century the person who has done most for the English

Effect of Personal Character in the King.

monarchy began her work as a girl, and said to Spring Rice fifty years ago, "Never mention the word 'trouble.' Only tell me how the thing is to be done, to be done rightly, and I will do it if I can."* It is possible, however, that Her Majesty's reign, though it has immensely strengthened the throne for the present, may have unexpected consequences. Whilst it lasts, the country is the happiest of republics, enjoying complete liberty under the presidency of the person most respected in the State. To go back, after that, to a condition of real subjection under a masterful and meddlesome king, is more than the English people would ever be likely to endure. It remains a question, too, whether the country would endure a king who, without being what might be called a tyrant, was simply determined to make his position a reality. Suppose, for example, that instead of being a minister, Lord Salisbury, with his governing instincts, had been king. He would have attempted to control many things, but would the loyalty of the country have borne the strain? What thoughtful English people say now in private, amounts to this: that the Queen will certainly remain undisturbed, that her son will probably have a quiet reign, and reap the fruits of his unsparing personal work, but that beyond him nothing is known. The old positive certainty about the duration of the monarchy in England, whatever the quality of the monarch, has given place to personal considerations.

Possible Consequence of the Victorian Epoch.

Possible Results of an Authoritative Reign.

Personal Considerations.

* *Memoirs of Mrs. Jameson*, by her niece Gerardine Macpherson, First Edition, p. 154.

A Future Radical Party.

There is another possibility that may lead to anything but settled rest and peace. The country may divide itself into extreme parties: the advocates of a really strong monarchy, with an active, ruling king, may be opposed to a vigorous radical party that would then be openly republican. If ever this should come to pass, it is hard to see how civil disturbance could be avoided. A determined sovereign, under such circumstances, might proclaim himself Emperor, not only of India, but of Great Britain, and the Gladstone of the day might answer that move by bold republicanism in the House of Commons.

The Future of France.

The future of France has now rather better prospects of stability, or might have them, if the effects of the next war with Germany were not so difficult to foresee. The reason is not because the French are less fickle than the English, but simply because they have got through more of the long revolutionary process, so that the new order is more under the protection of popular conservative instincts. There

Present Desire for Rest in France.

is also a strong desire for rest, a weariness of change after the most disturbed century of the national existence. The single wish of the people is to pursue their avocations in peace, and if the plain truth must be told, they have no longer the old capacity for political enthusiasm. The genuine

Extinction of the Royalist Sentiment.

royalist sentiment is almost extinct; if it lingers at all, it is only in a few aristocratic families, and hardly even in these since the death of Henry V. deprived it alike of object and aliment. Even the Count of Paris himself does not reverence the

Divine Right of royalty in his own person, since he condescends to bid against the Bonapartists for democratic acceptance.

Coolness of French Republican Sentiment. Coolness of the Young.

On the other hand, the republican sentiment, though resolute as to the preservation of republican forms, has certainly become wonderfully cool. The coolness of the young men is especially remarkable and significant. They are mostly republicans, it is true, and have no belief in the possibility of a monarchical restoration, but the more intelligent of them see the difficulties and the defects of a republican government very plainly, and they have a tendency to dwell upon those difficulties and defects in a manner that would astonish the militant republicans of the past. This composed and rational temper is the state of mind that comes upon all of us after the settled possession of an object, and it is a *sign* of settled possession. I myself have known two generations of French republicans, the ardent hopeful self-sacrificing men who looked forward, as from the desert to the promised land, and now their sons, for whom the promised land has the incurable defect of being no longer ideal.

Coolness a Sign of settled Possession.

Reason for the Probable Duration of the Democracy.

Democratic institutions may vary in their form and still remain democratic. I should not venture to predict eternal duration for the present French republican forms, but I believe that the democracy will last, if only because it is inconceivable that an aristocracy should ever destroy it and take its place. The strong popular conservative tendency which has been already noticed may possibly preserve both the senate and the presidence. Sir Henry Maine had a

Sir Henry Maine.

His Contemptuous Estimation of a French President.

very contemptuous estimate of the position of a French president, whose position he considered "pitiable." That is merely an example of the English habit of despising, already alluded to. If the position of president were "pitiable," it would not be so much coveted by the leading politicians. In dignity it is inferior, no doubt, to that of a great king, but it is superior to the minor royalties. In influence it is enough to say that it is superior to that of a merely ceremonial monarch, because the president presides over councils of ministers, and is, in fact, himself a permanent minister, or the only minister with any approach to permanence. It is not surprising that a constitutional sovereign should manifest a constant unwillingness to read speeches composed by others, to be afterwards criticised in Parliament with utter disregard of the royal name that covers them. A French president is at least permitted to write his own messages, which are the expression of his own opinions. The greatest function of a French president is a very lofty and noble one. It is to smooth asperities, to diminish the bad effect of political dissension, and to be watchful of the interests of the country. He has also a direct and immediate influence on foreign affairs, which has already proved useful on more than one occasion. These are reasons why the office may possibly be maintained, but there is another reason that affects the estimation of the republic in rural districts. The country looks to the president with satisfaction as the nearest approach to permanence that a democratic constitution can admit. What Bagehot said of

Influence of a French President.

the Queen twenty years ago is in a great measure true of the French president to-day. Amidst the frequent changes of ministers he is comparatively stable. The peasants follow with difficulty the names of successive ministers, but they all know the name of the president, and his portrait is seen everywhere. Their belief about the president is that he is a respectable, trustworthy man: "C'est un brave homme, Mossieu Grévy (or Carnot, as the case may be), je le crois b'en, moi." Is that nothing? It is not the Russian's adoration of the Czar, nor the German's affection for old Kaiser Wilhelm, but it is an element of tranquillity in the State.

# PART IV.

## RELIGION.

## CHAPTER I.

### STATE ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION.

An established religion is a religion under the especial protection of the Government, and which is held to be national, at least in this sense, that it represents the nation before the throne of God.

Degrees of Nationality in Established Religions.

There are, however, very different degrees of nationality in the religions themselves. Thus, to establish our first comparison between France and England, there is no religion whatever in France which is so national as the Anglican Church.

Subjection of Clergy to the State.

The clergy of the Church of England are in all things subject to the Queen, or to speak more accurately to Parliament. The bishops have exactly that degree of authority in their dioceses which Parliament allows them, and no more. Even in matters of doctrine and ritual the clergy are subject to the secular power. They are so entirely national that outside of the nation they have no earthly protector to appeal to. They might be despoiled of their possessions and privileges without calling forth so much as a remonstrance from any foreign potentate, and without arousing the slightest sympathy outside of the Anglo-Saxon race. They have a beautiful

Anglicanism on the Continent.

liturgy, but it is in English, and appreciated only by English readers. On the continent the Church of England wins hardly any proselytes, and can scarcely be said to exist except for British embassies and tourists.

Intense Nationality of Anglicanism.

No institution can be more intensely national than the Church of England. She is national by the very qualities that have made her unsuccessful abroad. She is national because she answers so exactly to the character and disposition of Englishmen, and particularly of Englishwomen. It is as fitting that she should be the established Church, so long as any established religion is held to be necessary, as it is that the national customs in food and dress should be the national customs.

Absence of a National Church in France.

In France we find no Church whatever that has this decided and peculiar character of nationality. France is said to be Catholic in the sense that the majority of the people profess the Roman Catholic religion, and it certainly does appear that this faith answers more nearly to the wants of French people than any other. Still, the French clergy is not national, it is *inter*national, it is nearer to the Roman Catholic priesthoods of Spain and Austria than it is to the French laity. Its head is not a Frenchman living in France but an Italian living in Italy, and its liturgy is in a foreign tongue. It accepts all Papal decisions, and it does not accept the decisions of the French Government. It looks with reverence to the Vatican, and without reverence to the Palais Bourbon and Elysée. Even in the use of words it follows a foreign authority. The French Government has re-

International Character of French Priesthood.

cognised the kingdom of Italy, and has an ambassador at the court of Rome. The pope has not recognised the King of Italy, but calls him the King of Piedmont. Less French than ultramontane, the clergy speak of the Italian Government as "le gouvernement Piedmontais."

British and French Systems of Establishment contrasted.

Another most essential difference between Great Britain and France with regard to State establishments of religion is that, although the British Government may have one establishment in one of the countries under its control and another in another country, it does not establish more than a single form of religion in the same place. Thus Anglicanism may be established in England and Presbyterianism in Scotland, whilst some politicians would have consented to the establishment of Roman Catholicism in Ireland; but no British statesman whatever would think of establishing the three religions *together* in all parts of the United Kingdom.

Co-establishment in France.

In France we find *co*-establishment, which is quite unknown in England. In France there are four State religions all established together, their ministers being paid by the State.

Change from Monarchical to Republican form of Government.

The change from a monarchical to a republican form of government has an influence on national religion in this way. In a monarchy the faith of the royal family is in a certain sense national even though there may be other faiths amongst the people, for when the sovereign prays for the nation he is, in a peculiar sense, its religious representative. This idea of the king representing the nation before the throne

A King a Religious Representative.

of God has come down to us from the most remote antiquity, and is as natural and inevitable as the leadership of the father of a family in domestic worship. It follows from this that the religion of the king is in a special sense the national religion, even though others may be protected by the State, and, so long as the English monarchy shall endure, the religion professed by the monarch can never be a matter of indifference.

In France the monarchy is at an end, and a republic has taken its place with a chief magistrate, who is a mere temporary official, who is not obliged to profess any religion whatever, and who has nothing august or sacred in his position like a Sovereign crowned and consecrated at Westminster or Rheims.

Absence of a National Representative of Religion in the French Republic.

To whom then are we to look as the religious representative of the nation? To the Archbishop of Paris? He is but the chief priest of one established religion out of four. To the minister of public worship? He has no religious function and is only an administrator. To the presidents of the Senate or the Chamber? They never, on the most important occasions, say any public prayers.

France, then, is a country where four religions are established in the sense of being protected and paid by the State, but not one of them is peculiarly the French religion as Anglicanism is the English religion.

Religious Indifference of Legislators.

The truth is that co-establishment is clear evidence of indifference on the part of the legislator. In this respect it is almost as significant as the

separation of Church and State, and is indeed accepted as an alternative to that radical measure. Both are suggested by the desire for equality, which may be attained either by disestablishing the dominant creed, or by establishing creeds of minorities, and this could be done in France more easily than in England, because the minor sects were few. By paying the ministers of two Protestant sects, and also the Jewish rabbis, the French legislator was able to satisfy nearly all his countrymen who do not belong to the Church of Rome. The priests of other religions would be paid, on the same principle, if their services were called for. In the lyceum at Marseilles a Pope of the Greek Church is paid as a chaplain along with the Catholic *aumônier*.

Effects of the Desire for Equality.

This solution of the difficulty has been found to answer in practice in our time, though it is not likely to be permanent. All thinking Frenchmen are aware that it contains a contradiction which is this. The State pays Catholic priests for affirming the real presence, and then pays Protestant ministers for denying it. The State pays Catholic and Protestant for declaring that Christ was God, and then pays Jews for saying that he was not God.

Contradiction involved in the System of Co-establishment.

To this a French statesman would probably reply that from the lay point of view this is the wisest policy. He would say, "It is lucky that we have got the Protestants and the Jews as a perceptible counter-weight to the Catholics, and one can only regret that they are not more numerous. We do

Use of a Multiplicity of Sects.

not want a single overwhelmingly powerful priesthood. The ideal state of things would be half a dozen sects of nearly equal strength, either paid alike or without endowment." In a word, the French policy in religious matters approaches very nearly to a neutral policy.

Is there anything resembling this neutrality in Great Britain? The answer is that the English have not exactly the same thing, but they have another thing that is not wholly unlike it. English statesmen, as we have already seen, will not establish contradictory religions within the limits of England itself, but they do not object to patronise and encourage the most opposite faiths in different parts of the Empire. In this sense the English Government comes near to a certain kind of neutrality, and it is on the whole a very tolerant Government, even towards small religious minorities that it does not directly patronise. The Unitarians, for example, though not paid by the State, are never molested now.

In what the English kind of Neutrality consists.

When statesmen reach this degree of impartiality, it becomes a question whether the same impartiality might not be equally well expressed by simply protecting every one in the exercise of his own religion, without payment or direct patronage of any kind. In Russia a State Church is evidently a natural institution. The religion of the Czar must be the true religion for the peasant, who is not to suppose that the Czar can be wrong in so important a matter; but with the non-religious character of the French

Government and the tolerant character of the English, the idea gains ground that the duty of the State to all creeds is simply protection, and no more. This opens the question of establishment, which will be briefly examined in the following chapter.

Modern Idea of the Duty of the State.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### DISESTABLISHMENT IN FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

Disestablishment more simple in France than in England.

THERE are two reasons why the road to disestablishment is plainer in France. The first is the abolition of the monarchy, which takes away the defender of the royal faith. The second is the payment of the clergy by the State. The disestablishment and disendowment of the French Churches would, in practice, be a task of extreme simplicity. Parliament would merely decline to vote the *budget des cultes*, a refusal that may happen any day, and the Churches would be thrown on their own resources. In England there is a vast capital sum to be disposed of, and though it excites cupidity, the parties hostile to the establishment are unable to agree about the employment of it.

Effects of Legislation in the two Countries.

The temper of Englishmen is averse to a sudden change that is carried out all over the country. In France, whatever happens in legislation affects all France; but Great Britain has divisions which conveniently allow of experiments in this field or that, without extending them at once over all the national estate. Thus it may be predicted that when disestablishment takes place in France it will be co-extensive with the frontiers, whilst in Great Britain

and Ireland, it was tried at first in Ireland, and will be tried a second time in Scotland or Wales.

Question of Pecuniary Honour in France.

A most important reason why it has not been effected of late years in France is the question of pecuniary honour. The question is this. Can the State honourably refuse to continue annuities which are in fact nothing but the interest of capital taken from the Church by the secular power? This consideration has great weight in a country that takes a just pride in continuing regular payments in spite of the disturbance caused by so many changes of government.

Argument of the Advocates of Disestablishment.

The objection, however, which looks unanswerable at first, is met by the advocates of disestablishment in two ways. First, they say that the property held by the Church in former times was generally ill-gotten, that is, by terrorising the consciences of the credulous; and next, they argue that a corporation is not like an individual or a family.

Then there is an objection, not on the ground of right but of simple policy. "Supposing it possible to confiscate the priests' stipends honourably, would it be wise or prudent to do so?" Whenever they are ill-used, even to a much less degree than that, they immediately proclaim themselves martyrs. If their salaries were withheld there would be an immense display of clerical indigence. The clergy might excite much popular sympathy by appearing as one vast mendicant order, with ragged cassocks, and they would certainly do all in their power to arouse the indignation of the peasantry against the Government. Then they would put a great part of

Probable Policy of the Priesthood.

the country under a sort of interdict. Even already the reactionary parties prepare the way for something of this description by spreading rumours amongst the peasantry. According to these rumours the republic intends to deprive the peasantry of religious rites, so that their children are to remain unbaptized, and their dead are to be buried like dogs. These rumours have frequently reached me through the peasants themselves, and they are generally traceable to the efforts of reactionary candidates during election times. Cautious republicans think that to abolish the *budget des cultes* would be to provide the clergy and the monarchists with a very dangerous weapon. More than this, they believe that if disestablishment is intended to weaken and impoverish the clergy it will have an exactly contrary effect. The Church always gets whatever money she requires. Her power of renewing her wealth after immense losses is founded on the assured support of the rich. Here is a case in point. In consequence of the *laïcisation* of a school a few "brethren of the Christian doctrine" were put out of employment. The curé of the place started a subscription to get a home for them, and in a week he had got together nearly two thousand pounds.* Now, for comparison's sake, imagine starting a subscription in the same place for some purpose of secular intellectual culture, such as the encouragement of scientific research or the purchase of prints or casts.

Abolition of the *Budget des Cultes.*

The Priests readily procure money.

* This curé was an acquaintance of mine. His sister-in-law told me the amount of the subscription as an example of clerical influence.

You could not, in such a place, scrape together two thousand pence.

No one who knows France will venture upon predictions about French affairs. I may, however, indicate certain alternatives which the course of future events can scarcely altogether avoid.

There is the indefinite prolongation of the present system, by which opposite religions are endowed. This may continue for a long time, but it is not likely to last for ever. The annual payment of a tribute to the clergy is, like all tributes, a constantly-recurring vexation. In itself it is enough to revive hostility, which might otherwise pass into indifference. It will not let sleeping dogs lie. If it should ever happen, which is by no means impossible, that the opponents of the *budget des cultes* can unite a small majority, the clergy will open their newspapers one morning and see a brief announcement that their salaries are stopped.

Co-establishment not likely to be permanent in France.

A more probable event is that, according to the proposal of M. Yves Guyot, the State will disembarrass itself of responsibility by handing over the payment to the *communes*. According to this system the money would be given to the municipal council in each commune, to be expended either in the payment of the clergy, or for any other purpose of public utility that the majority of each council might prefer. There could then be no complaint against the Government, which would escape all responsibility. That would fall upon the municipal electors in each commune separately, who would have them-

Project of M. Yves Guyot.

selves to thank if they were deprived of religious ministrations.

Practical Result of M. Guyot's Project.

The result of this, in practice, would be a partial and perhaps progressive disestablishment. The clergy would be paid in some communes, perhaps in the majority, but not in others. The change would therefore come without any general shock. This scheme may be agreeable to the numerous enemies of the clergy, who will have the wit to perceive that it offers a kind of bribe to the municipal councils, which are seldom rich, and almost invariably desire to do more than their limited means permit.* The more prudent republicans might accept it as affording a ground of complaint less advantageous, polemically, to the clergy.

It is unnecessary for me to go into detail about the question of the disestablishment in England. Every English reader knows the present state of that question in his own country, and a few years hence whatever could be written in this book would only be out of date. I may, however, in a book of comparison between the two countries, point to the essential difference between disestablishment in France and England. In France it is desired by the aggressive secular spirit which is doing all it can to *laïcise* the country thoroughly. In England it is the unestablished religious communities that supply most of the motive power, and the spirit which animates

Difference between Disestablishment in France and England.

* Here is a case well known to me. The income of the commune is 3000 francs, that of the curé about 1000. To offer the free disposal of the curé's income to the municipal council is to offer a great temptation.

them is not the secular spirit at all, but religious and social jealousy. Religious and Social Jealousy.

The use of this word "jealousy" looks like an attack upon the nonconformists, but it is not employed here in a hostile sense. If jealousy is a mental aberration when it makes people see falsely, it is not so when there is no perversion of facts. Nay, there may be circumstances when an awakened jealousy casts a clear light on unpleasant truths which would otherwise escape us. It is not in human nature that communities placed in a position of manifest social inferiority should not be jealous of the one community whose predominance makes them inferior. It *is* in human nature that, even when there is no active oppression, the inferior communities should desire a change which would relieve them from a degrading name. Dissenters Naturally and Excusably Jealous.

The intellectual freethinker is not usually, in England, at all eager for disestablishment. The existence of a broadly tolerant State Church is not, from his point of view, a very great hindrance to liberty of thought. What he most dreads is a watchful universal inquisition, in which every man and especially every woman is an inquisitor always ready to examine him as to his opinions, and call him to account for omissions in religious "exercises." A distinguished Englishman of this class, a scientific agnostic, said to me, "It would be a mistake to bring on disestablishment. The Church is more tolerant than the dissenters. The English state of things is more favourable to individual liberty than the American." Opinion of Intellectual Freethinkers.

## CHAPTER III.

### SOCIAL POWER.

The Test of Social Power.

WHAT I mean by the social power of a religion is the power of enforcing conformity by the double sanction of social rewards and penalties. If the clergy can improve the social position of one who submits to them, and if they can inflict upon the nonconformist any, even the slightest, stigma of social inferiority, then I should say that such a clergy was socially powerful. It would be still more powerful if it did not appear in the matter in any direct way, but was able to attain the same ends through a laity influenced and educated by itself, a laity acting under the illusion of perfect freedom like a hypnotised patient under the influence of "suggestion."

We have seen that there is a plurality of established religions in France, that Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Jews are equally recognised by the State. The political equality of these religions is perfect, but is their social equality of the same kind?

Absence of Social Equality amongst Religions in France.

Certainly not. The Church of Rome, having been formerly the one State Church allied for many centuries with the monarchy and the aristocracy, has preserved in these days of nominal equality an almost

unshaken social preponderance. Quite independently of the odium attached to Jews, which is as much a question of race as of religion, the Church of Rome has been able, in France, to produce a general impression that a gentleman must be a Roman Catholic, and that a Protestant, though he may follow his religion even more faithfully than most Catholics follow theirs, is not likely to be *"un homme du meilleur monde."*

The Word "Protestant" in French and English.

If an English boy were told to translate "He is a Protestant" into French, he would probably write "Il est Protestant," and the translation would be accepted as correct. It is technically but not socially accurate. The French word has a *nuance* of social inferiority that the English fails to convey, and when used by a genuine French Catholic it implies in addition a *nuance* of reprobation. Is there any English word that would carry these meanings with it? Certainly there is. The word "dissenter" carries them quite perfectly.

Mr. Voysey.

I remember that Mr. Voysey, the English free-thinking clergyman, warned the dissenters some years ago against the idea, illusory according to him, that by disestablishing the Church of England they would attain to social equality. "You will do nothing of the kind," he said, in substance if not in words; "Anglicanism will still be the fashionable religion, and you will be just as unfashionable and inferior as you are at present." Nor is it probable that any mere legislative enactment would procure the abolition of the term "dissenter," any more than of what is implied by it.

Social Weakness of Law.

The Example of France.

France may afford to English nonconformists an excellent opportunity of comparing legal equality with that social inequality which the justice of the law is unfortunately impotent to redress.

The French Protestants form a little world apart, which (except, perhaps, in the most Protestant districts, and they are of small extent) appears to be outside the current of the national life. Just as, in England, you may live in the upper classes for a lifetime without having once been inside a dissenter's house, or seen a dissenter eat, so in France aristocratic people go from the cradle to the grave without having seen the inside of an "evangelical" home. I am not speaking of real religious bigotry, of that evil-spirited intolerance which hates the Protestant as a schismatic, and would revive the old horrible penalties against him if it could; I am speaking only of the mild modern objection to people who are under the ban of a social prejudice.

Isolation of Protestants in France.

A ban of this kind falls with very different effect on different persons. It scarcely troubles elderly people in comfortable circumstances, who are content with a retired life, but it weighs heavily on the young. A Protestant girl in a French country town may have admirable virtues and a good education, but the simple fact that she belongs to an inferior religious community restricts her chances of marriage. In both England and France a young man may suffer both in that and in other ways from his connection with an unfashionable sect. A young Englishman may come to turning-points in his career where an Anglican will be preferred to a dissenter,

Disadvantage of belonging to the Inferior Sects.

even although no question of religious belief may avowedly be involved. A valuable office may be given to merit when the qualities of a dissenter would not be taken into consideration. I am thinking of a real instance when a man of great merit received a private appointment which would certainly not have been offered to a nonconformist, yet the work to be done had no connection with theology. In France I know several successful men who, if they had been Protestants, would have been left out in the cold. If this may still be the case in an age that has made such very real advances in justice, what was it two or three generations since? Then the dissenter was literally an outlaw;* to-day he is so only in a social and metaphorical sense. A Frenchman once said to me, *"Un Français qui n'est pas Catholique est hors de la loi,"* but the law of good society was understood, not the law of the land.

Dissenters in England.

Protestants in France.

Dissenters in Former Times.

In both countries alike, it is but fair to admit that a merely nominal orthodoxy is accepted, and that a man is not required to believe anything in his own intellect and conscience, if he will only conform to certain outward ceremonies. In France the Church has become so accommodating that it is not

Only a Nominal Orthodoxy required.

Facilities of Modern Catholicism.

* "'And will not one man in the town help him, no constables—no law?'

"'Oh, he's a Quaker, the law don't help Quakers.'

"That was the truth—the hard, grinding truth—in those days. Liberty, justice, were idle names to nonconformists of every kind; and all they knew of the glorious constitution of English law was that its iron hand was turned against them."—*John Halifax*, ch. VIII.

now any harder to be a Catholic than a fashionable Anglican. The Church requires hardly anything that can be unpleasant to the upper classes (the fasts are only a variety of good eating), and conformity now consists in little else than attendance at a weekly mass. In some respects French orthodoxy is more compatible with freedom than its English counterpart. After mass, and an early low mass is sufficient, a French gentleman is free to amuse himself on Sunday as he pleases. There is, indeed, a rather stern French puritanism which objects to theatres on Sunday, but it objects to them equally on all other days of the week.

Liberty of French Catholics.

Aversion to Nominal Heterodoxy.

But if a nominal orthodoxy is accepted, a nominal heterodoxy is still regarded with aversion. It is a mere question of names. Here is a case in which the persons concerned were known to me. A young gentleman asks a young Catholic lady in marriage and is accepted. He is perfectly well known to be a freethinker, as he is entirely without hypocrisy, never even going to church. Some enemy sets in circulation a sinister rumour to the effect that he is a Protestant. This might have broken off the marriage if he had not been able to prove his Catholic baptism. If people were to put realities before names, it clearly could not be of any importance to what religion a freethinker nominally belonged when he was a baby. It is not the baby who is to be married, but the man. The anxiety in this case was to avoid the objectionable word "Protestant." The reader may wonder if *libre penseur* would not be infinitely worse. Perhaps, but it is ingeniously avoided

Names and Realities.

by saying, "*Monsieur X est Catholique, mais il ne pratique pas.*"

It would be an omission to close this chapter without recognising the existence of a quite unforeseen source of strength for dominant and fashionable religions. That is, the *preferential* support of well-educated unbelievers. It is not an active or a visible support, but it exists extensively, and the value of it steadily increases with the growth of cultivated doubt. What the unbeliever most dreads and detests is to be worried by rude religious enthusiasts. He does not dislike a priest or a parson who is discreet, and ready to sink religious differences in personal intercourse; nay, he may even be attracted to this wise clergyman, as to a man of intellect and education, who has an ideal above the level of the Philistine vulgar. The experienced unbeliever is generally of opinion that discretion and liberality are more likely to be found in an ancient Church that is bound up with the life and experience of the great world, than in the narrower and more inquisitorial strictness of the minor sects. Hence the curious but unquestionable fact, that in England the cultivated unbeliever prefers the Anglican Church to the dissenting bodies, and does not wish to see them become predominant, whilst in France he dislikes the Protestants more than the Romish priests. This preference arises simply from the unbeliever's knowledge of the state of things most conducive to his personal comfort, and has nothing to do with theological doctrines, which are a matter of indifference to him in

Support given by Unbelievers to Dominant Religions.

Discretion and Liberality in the Clergy.

Personal Comfort of Unbelievers.

any case. In France, he especially congratulates himself that the dominant religion is not Sabbatarian, the reason being that Sabbatarianism is much more than a theological doctrine, as it passes so easily into legislative domination over all men.

## CHAPTER IV.

### FAITH.

Two senses of the Word "Faith."

THE word "Faith" is used in two different senses. In ordinary language it means little more than a custom or a name. When people say that Napoleon I. belonged to the Roman Catholic faith, they only mean that he bore the name and followed the external customs of that religion, for we know that his own belief was a kind of fatalistic deism. The facility with which some exalted personages have gone from one faith to another, and in some cases have even repeated the change for obviously political reasons, is explicable only by reading the word "Faith" as a custom or a ceremony.

How employed here.

The sense in which it will be employed in the following pages is that of sincere inward conviction. Evidently this must be far more difficult to ascertain than those acts of external conformity which are intended to be visible by all. In a world like this, where there is so little moral courage, people are easily browbeaten, easily terrorised, and they have in general such an abject dread of any term implying degradation or disgrace, whilst they are at the same time so keenly alive to the advantages of social advancement, that it seems at first sight impossible

to find any sure test of the genuineness of their professions.

The Test of Sacrifice.

There is, however, one sure test, and that is sacrifice. When people make *real* sacrifices for their faith its sincerity is unquestionable. But we must be well on our guard in admitting the reality of the sacrifice. It may seem to be real when it is only a payment for something held to be more valuable than itself. Pecuniary sacrifices prove nothing when the donor gets consideration in return, more valuable to him than superfluous money. It costs no trouble to write a cheque.

Deceptive Nature of Pecuniary Sacrifices.

The Tests of Sincerity.

Personal labour and trouble, *that cannot be delegated to working inferiors,* are the best test of sincerity on the active side. On the passive side, there is the sacrifice of the things that make life pleasant, its comforts and luxuries, and the happiness of home and friendship, and especially the renunciation of worldly ambition.

A Sketch from Life.

Here is a sketch from life. A young French gentleman, the eldest son of a rich man, leaves father and mother and a luxurious home to join one of the teaching orders. The discipline is severe. To begin with, the aspirant must be ordained, and therefore renounces marriage. He also renounces wealth by taking the vow of voluntary poverty, and he gives up his liberty by the vow of obedience. In this instance, the young man went into exile, as his order was one of the unauthorised congregations, and he sacrificed health because the discipline was more than his delicate frame could bear. The work to be done, year after year, is tedious. Imagine a rich

Renunciations.

and cultivated young gentleman doing usher's work in a poor school for less than usher's pay, indeed for no pay, expect a providing of the barest necessaries! The separation from home and family, without being absolutely complete, as in some orders, is nearly so. Rarely, very rarely, the teacher revisited his old home, where his place knew him no more.

I have talked with his father about the immensity of this sacrifice. The father (who is himself a profoundly religious man) feels unable to conceive adequately the strength of a man's natural will, that can carry out such a sacrifice through life, and accounts for it by the supposition (in his own mind a certainty) that the devotee receives an unfailing supernatural support. It is, at any rate, clear evidence of genuine faith.

Explanation by Supernatural Support.

In the feminine world we find many examples of sacrifice at least equivalent to this. Not a week before I write this page the daughter of a neighbouring farmer came to say good-bye to us. She belongs to the best class of French peasants, is a comely, well-grown, healthy girl, and might easily have married. She has chosen rather to join a teaching Order, and an Order that is principally employed in the French colonies. It is an austere and hard life that she has before her, and it is highly improbable that she will ever revisit her old home. This case also is evidently one of genuine conviction.

Case of a Peasant Girl.

It is unnecessary to multiply examples. It is not the splendour of the Papacy or the episcopate that is the true glory of the Church of Rome, but

The Working Orders in the Church of Rome.

the steady and modest devotion of her working Orders. What is more beautiful than the life of a Sister of Charity or a "Little Sister of the Poor"? Good Catholics call them "My Sister" when speaking to each of them individually, and so do I who am not a Catholic, for are they not sisters of all of us who may be laid one day on a bed of sickness? If we do not need their gentle watching for ourselves, it soothes our suffering brethren.

The "Little Sisters of the Poor."

And what a dull monotonous existence many of them accept! What tiresome and even repulsive duties they go through without flinching! I know a house kept by some "Little Sisters," where there are eighty old paupers entirely fed and tended by them. The "Little Sisters" go about begging for remnants of food with a small van, and they never eat anything themselves until they have fed their eighty poor. Two or three of the Sisters do the washing. They are in the washhouse from morning till night to keep the old folks clean. Have I ever done as much?—have you? Till we have sacrificed our own ease and comfort in this way, or in some way equivalent to this, the next best thing we can do is to respect such self-sacrifice in others. One of these "Little Sisters" in the house I know remained humble and unknown like the rest, but when she was gone we learned by accident that she was of princely rank.

Evidence collected by Maxime du Camp.

Maxime du Camp has studied the charitable self-sacrifice of women belonging to the higher classes. The abundant facts that he collected were not a surprise for me, but if any English reader happens to

retain the old prejudice that all Frenchwomen are frivolous he ought to read du Camp's evidence.

Cheerfulness a Characteristic of the Active Sisterhoods.

The active sisterhoods are repaid to some extent in this world by a beneficent law of human nature. They have one remarkably uniform characteristic; they seem to be invariably cheerful, with bright moments of innocent gaiety. This serenity of mind may be explained naturally without having recourse to miracle. It is gained by the ever-present sense of duties accomplished in the past and the determination to face them in the future. It is the spirit that inspired Wordsworth's "Ode to Duty" with a health surpassing all songs of love and wine.

The Saintly Nature in Protestantism.

These are instances of the saintly nature in practice. I remember a very dear Roman Catholic friend of mine, a Frenchman, asking me if I thought it possible that the saintly nature could develop itself under the influences of Protestantism. It seemed to him that Protestantism must check its heroic spirit and bring it down to the commonplace. I answered that the purest example of the saintly nature I had ever known was an Anglican lady. She belongs to no order and is nothing but a lonely old maid, who has taken all who suffer to be her sisters and brethren. She gives them the whole of her time, the whole of her strength, and all her money except what is reserved for a bare subsistence. She spends seven shillings a week on her own food and lodgings, and as for dress, she is content with anything that will cover her.* For perfect courage she is as good as

An Anglican Saint.

* This excellent lady went on a visit to an old friend, who found her appearance so miserable that she took the liberty of

any Catholic saint in the calendar. There is no malady so repulsive or so contagious that she will not cheerfully nurse the patient. These practices are by no means of recent adoption. The lady in question has been leading a saint's life for twenty or thirty years. The intensity of her religious belief reaches the limits of hallucination. Like Joan of Arc, she hears the angels sing. Whenever a good Christian dies she is filled with a serene joy, thinking only of the glad new birth in heaven. Like Sister Dora, she has strong physical health, and can therefore forget the body as the rich need not think of money. Her existence is almost angelic already; she lives in a sort of ecstasy, and is as ignorant of this world as a cloistered nun. Had she been a Roman Catholic she would have attained to papal beatification.

Life of an Anglican Saint.

This example is good evidence that the saintly nature may flourish in perfection outside the Church of Rome, though the fact remains that Roman Catholicism *encourages* the development of that character beyond the limits of reason, whilst the cooler faith of Anglicanism does not encourage it so far. It is therefore not improbable that saints of the heroic type are more common in France than in England.

Romanism and Anglicanism withregard to the Saintly Life.

clothing her from head to foot. The saint was *aware* that she had been clothed, but neither pleased nor offended. She only laughed, and I believe her secret satisfaction in the matter was that she could give the old clothes to some beggar. I hope, but feel by no means sure, that she did not give away the *new* ones, which were a surprising improvement to her appearance.

When we come to religious work done in common life by people without the special saintly vocation, there may be as much of it in England. Many of my readers will be acquainted with English people who quite unostentatiously give time and labour to the lower classes, either directly in the service of Christianity or simply in behalf of civilisation against barbarism. I know a busy English layman who gives a whole day every week, besides one or two evenings, to Christianising work, often sacrificing necessary rest. He is remarkably free from cant of all kinds, and opposed to asceticism. Such examples remain almost unknown, and may therefore be more numerous than we suspect, but it is not usually the male sex that does the most work of this kind. At a time when a book of mine called *Human Intercourse* was published, an Anglican clergyman wrote me a friendly letter, in which he pointed to a special reason for the intimate alliance between "priests and women" in works requiring time and trouble. He said (in effect if not in words) that the clergy would as willingly appeal to men if they were likely to find in them co-adjutors equally zealous, but that men are comparatively useless.*

Religious Work in Common Life.

An Anglican Layman.

A Good Reason for the Alliance between Priests and Women.

To this I felt inclined to answer, in defence of the irreligious sex, that men have commonly too much on their minds in business to leave them much liberty for religious undertakings. Besides this, independently of all questions of faith, the feminine

* "Her faith through form is pure as thine,
*Her hands are quicker unto good.*"
*In Memoriam.*

nature is kinder than ours, and more disposed to beneficent interference.

Faith outside of this Creed or that.

It shocks a Catholic to be told that a Protestant may have strong and saintly faith, and it equally shocks a Protestant to be told that strong faith may be the ruling motive of an unbeliever in Christianity, yet it may be so. If we admit self-sacrifice as evidence of faith in one case, we must admit it equally in another. There is nothing so galling to human nature as the loss of social place and consideration, and it is usually in that form that unbelievers have learned the hardship of sacrifice. It requires immense faith in the ultimate value of veracity to express an unfashionable opinion.

Faith in the Value of Veracity.

Now, this kind of faith has been by no means rare in France during the last hundred years. Much of the old spirit of faith once exclusively religious, has transferred itself in France to political and social convictions. The democratic idea is not without its saints and martyrs, who have been willing to sacrifice all the comforts of existence for a belief and a hope detached from any personal success.

Faith transferred from Religion to Politics.

## CHAPTER V.

### FORMALISM.

THE distinction between formalism and hypocrisy in religion is, that the formalist follows a custom without setting up any claim to depth or sincerity of conviction, whilst the hypocrite falsely pretends to be full of godliness and zeal. Distinction between Formalism and Hypocrisy.

There is probably not a religion in the world that presents so large a proportion of formalists and so few complete hypocrites as the Anglican. Decorous obedience to all outward religious observances is very frequently combined in England with an entire absence of pretension to sanctity. The gentlemanly Englishman is a regular attendant at church, he does not forget to say grace at dinner, but he dislikes cant of all kinds, and it is a part of his habitual reserve to say nothing about his religious experiences. His observance of form is so perfect that you may be acquainted with him for many years without knowing what he really thinks. About politics he is open enough, but he makes you feel that it would be indiscreet to ask for any confidences on religion, it would be like asking for his opinion of his wife. He, on his part, is too well bred to betray any anxiety for the state of your own soul; he is not Formalism in the Anglican Communion. The well-bred Anglican.

a member of the Salvation Army, and your eternal welfare is not any concern of his.

The Formalist and his Conscience.

Who shall fix precisely the exact place at which formalism ends and real hypocrisy begins? The formalist has a sort of conscience which forbids him to go much beyond strictly ceremonial limits. He will seem to use his prayer-book in church, yet will sometimes shrink from reading prayers aloud in his own home. He would listen respectfully if a chaplain read them, but declines to do it with his own voice. I remember one excellent father of a family who had no objection to take his children to church, but nothing could induce him to conduct family worship, and in that household the wife and mother was the chaplain. Still, this is not any certain test. An

Case of an English Atheist.

English gentleman once told me that he had been a convinced atheist from boyhood, yet he went to church with unfailing regularity, and read family prayers like a clergyman. Are we to call this formalism or hypocrisy? I will leave the gentleman to make his own defence. He said that he was absolutely compelled to conform to the national religion externally, and might as well make his conformity thorough, the more so that it was natural for a family to have a religion, and he knew of none better than the Church of England.

Scotchman and Dissenters.

The true English formalist looks upon the Scotch and the dissenters as more frequently exposed to the vice of hypocrisy than he is himself. He is so careful to keep anything resembling piety out of his ordinary language that it seems to him ill bred in a Scotchman to make pious reference to the Scriptures

or the Sabbath Day. On the other hand, he unfeignedly disapproves of the continental Sunday, because forms are not so steadily observed on the Continent, and it seems to him as if the French and Germans did not know how to behave.

Formalism in France.

Now with regard to formalism in France I should say that in the upper classes, where it exists in the greatest force, it is even more a matter of ceremonial usage than in England. Has the reader ever observed French gentlemen in church? How many of them have any appearance, even, of taking part in the service! They are present for the most part as spectators of a "function" only—they support it by their presence, by their respectful deportment, and that is all.

French Gentlemen.

French Marriages and Funerals.

French formalism has taken its last and most determined stand on marriages and funerals. Here it is strongly sustained by the general sentiment that a ceremony is needed on such important occasions, and the Church of Rome understands ceremony so well that she gives complete satisfaction to this instinctive need. Quite independently of special theological tenets, it is felt that marriage requires some kind of blessing or consecration, and that a solemn pomp should accompany the dead man to his grave.

Religious Interments of French Unbelievers.

I remember being in a room with a number of Frenchmen when the conversation turned upon funerals. "You will all of you," I said, "be buried with the ceremonial of the Church of Rome, and there is not one of you who is really a Catholic or even a Christian, except in the sense that you be-

lieve Jesus to have been a good man. Why this clinging to ceremonies that have lost their meaning for you? Why not be buried with rites in accordance with your convictions?" An old lawyer made himself the spokesman of the party in reply. He said, "The disposal of our remains is almost invariably decided by the ladies of the family, who abominate civil interments. Besides this, many Frenchmen are neither convinced Catholics nor convinced unbelievers either, so they cling to established forms." I then referred the question to a lady in connection with a recent Catholic interment of a sincere unbeliever, and she answered that the ceremony, being a matter of usage, really implied no affirmation whatever concerning the faith of the dead man, but was the only way of doing him a little honour, as none of those present would have dared to attend a civil burial.*

A Civil Funeral.

* Hardly any one with the least pretension to rank or station, unless he might be some republican functionary, would venture to attend a civil interment in a French provincial town. A lady who knows the interest I take in these matters, wrote me a letter in March 1886, from which I make the following extract:—

"Il vient de passer sous mes fenêtres un convoi de la Libre Pensée, ce titre étant brodé en lettres d'argent sur tous les côtés du corbillard, qui est très beau avec ses franges d'argent. Une très grosse couronne d'immortelles rouges est placée sur le cercueil, et tous les assistants en portaient à la boutonnière. Le convoi marchait très lentement, très silencieusement. Que de méchants propos se disaient sur le passage du cortège! Nous n'avons pas encore le droit à l'indépendance. Il faudra bien des années pour que nous ayons notre libre arbitre sans être calomniés."

One of the most interesting of comparisons between England and France in the present day is suggested by philosophical Anglicanism, but before seeking for the French equivalent we need some definition of the English original.

Philosophical Anglicanism.

It appears to be a condition of absolute mental freedom, a freedom fully equal to that enjoyed by M. Renan, for example, combined with adhesion to all Anglican forms and a clinging to the Anglican name. The philosophical Anglican criticises the sacred texts, has no respect for dogma, and expresses his own opinions in language of refreshing candour and frankness, yet at the same time he will not be called a dissenter, and is certainly not a nonconformist. He has his seat in church with the motto *"J'y suis et j'y reste."*

Its Mental Freedom.

The opinions of a philosophical Anglican are individual, and so much his own that we cannot justly attribute any one set of opinions to two men, each of whom would repudiate responsibility for the other. Some opinions appear to be what we should once have called Unitarian, others belong to pure Deism, and the more advanced to scientific Agnosticism, in which the existence of a conscious and thinking Deity seems doubtful and the continuity of life beyond the grave a dream. As for the old dogmas, they are treated as the subjects of past controversies. The Trinity and the Incarnation have

Opinions held by different Philosophical Anglicans.

Their Treatment of Dogma.

Insults addressed to a funeral procession are immensely significant in France, where so much outward respect is usually paid to the dead.

gone the way of the Real Presence,* though we may still retain for them a kind of imaginative credence like that which, in reading Tennyson, we have for the Holy Grail.

Difference between Philosophical Anglicanism and ordinary Formalism.

Philosophical Anglicanism differs from ordinary formalism in this, that whereas the ordinary formalist is condemned to life-long silence because he dares not say what he thinks, the philosophical Anglican, whilst accepting all the forms like the other, has assumed complete liberty of utterance. In short, he is a formalist who is tired of being gagged. How he reconciles his liberty of thought and speech with the old submission to forms and names it is not my business to explain. The remarkable peculiarity of the case, and its special interest, is that in the leaders of the movement there is no hypocrisy.

Honest Frankness of the Leaders.

Even Mr. Tollemache, who admits a certain *ésotérisme inévitable*, takes away that ground for the accusation of hypocrisy by putting the secret into print. All is clear and above-board with the leaders, but it may be suspected that with many of their

Followers probably not so Frank.

followers the *ésotérisme inévitable* is carried so far in prudence that their position is not morally different from that of the everyday English formalist, already so familiar to us. Therefore, in spite of the really admirable honesty of Mr. Arnold and Mr. Tollemache, I am not sure that the movement is favourable to honesty in the rank and file, who will not feel under the same obligation to take mankind

* For Mr. Arnold the Trinity was "the fairy tale of the Three Supernatural Men."

into their confidence. And with respect to the clergy the examples of Dean Stanley and Mark Pattison are even less encouraging, since in their case the *ésotérisme inévitable* must assume still larger proportions. What they thought I do not profess to know, as we have not any clear and brief statement of their views, but they were certainly freethinkers in the sense of not being deterred by dogma. Subject to correction from their admirers, I should say that their opinions did not differ essentially from those of Renan. They may have accepted the *moral* side of the Christian religion, but even in that they would probably reject what obviously belonged to an early stage of civilisation. The danger of their example consits in encouraging a class of freethinking clergymen, who must necessarily defend an essentially false position by the most disingenuous arts.

Philosophical Anglicanism amongst the Clergy.

Most of my English readers will have their own opinion on these phases of English thought, and will care more to hear whether there is anything corresponding to them in France. The answer that first suggests itself is that Liberal Protestantism as represented by M. Réville* is the French form of the same thing, but a little reflection shows that Liberal Protestantism differs from philosophical Anglicanism in having no social importance. It is something like an advanced development of Unitarianism in England, which would not disturb English society in the least. If Mr. Arnold had been professedly a Unitarian,

Liberal French Protestantism.

* This is a religion entirely without dogma, and Christian only in the sense that it would cultivate a Christian spirit.

his announcement of advanced views would have interested a small sect; but as he professed Anglicanism, and was an influential leader of opinion, his thoughts interest all who belong, really or nominally, to the National Church. A French Arnold would have to arise within the pale of the Church of Rome, where his career as a reformer would shortly come to an end.

Nearest French equivalent to Philosophical Anglicanism.

The nearest French equivalent for philosophical Anglicanism is the theory that the religion a man professes is a matter of heredity in his family, and that as an individual he takes what he likes of it and no more. This theory differs, however, from philosophical Anglicanism in one important point—*it is never published to the world.* When expressed at all, which happens very seldom, it is expressed in the privacy of conversation, but the tacit acceptance of it is very wide. The genuine Catholics insist, on the contrary, that "all or nothing" is the one immutable principle of their religion, and that he who disbelieves the minutest detail of the Catholic dogmas is no more a Catholic than if he professed Protestantism openly.* However this may be, the fact remains, that any Frenchman who conforms externally to the Church of Rome is counted as a Catholic from the social point of view. I need not

The Genuine Catholics.

External Conformity in France.

* I have even known a sincere and severe Catholic who told me that no one who disobeyed habitually the moral law, whatever his beliefs, could be a Catholic. Giving drunkenness as an example, he said that there had never been such a person as a Catholic drunkard, because by the mere fact of being a drunkard a man proved that he was not a Catholic.

expatiate upon the convenience of the theory that the doctrines of the Church are like a banquet offered, of which the guest may take only what his appetite demands. We most of us accept *something* that might be called a Catholic doctrine, if only that it is wrong to steal.

Besides this lax idea amongst laymen, there is the influence of Jesuitism amongst the clergy. The Jesuits are said to confess the *ésotérisme inévitable* of a great popular religion so frankly that the modern intellectual man may find complete liberty in the Church of Rome. It appears that by an ingenious manner of presenting them all Roman Catholic doctrines may be made capable of a liberal interpretation in order that the modern thinker may remain within the fold.* Even the very spirit of

Jesuitism.

Liberty in the Church of Rome.

* How much intellectual liberty is now enjoyed within the Roman pale may be seen in Mr. Mivart's most interesting article on "The Catholic Church and Biblical Criticism" published in *The Nineteenth Century* for July 1887. Mr. Mivart does not think it probable that a line of the Bible was written by Moses, whilst it is "in the highest degree unlikely that Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob ever really existed, and no passage of the history of any one of them is of the slightest historical value in the old sense." The book of Jonah is a parable, that of Daniel quite untrustworthy and little more than a mass of fiction. With regard to the Deluge Mr. Mivart says, "I well recollect dining at a priest's house (in or about 1870) when one of the party, the late accomplished Mr. Richard Simpson of Clapham (a most pious Catholic and weekly communicant), expressed some ordinary scientific views on the subject of the Deluge. A startled auditor asked anxiously, 'But is not, then, the account in the Bible of the Deluge true?' To which Mr. Simpson replied, 'True! of course it is true. There was a local inundation, and

Mr. Mivart.

Catholicism is ready to adapt itself to his taste. If he dislikes an intolerant spirit, the Church becomes most tolerant. He is told that all sincere men who endeavour to do right are sure of salvation, whatever may be their religious belief. If it is painful to him to think that the damned are suffering eternal torture, he is soothed by the assurance that the flames of hell are a figure of speech, and that the real punishment of the damned is only regret for their misdeeds, and privation of the sight of God, two evils that all Christians suffer from in this present world without finding it unendurable.

Pliability of Modern Catholicism.

The success of what is called "Ritualism" in England has some connection with the increase of formalism, though we ought to remember that the formal spirit attaches itself quite as readily to a plain and simple ceremonial as it does to a splendid and elaborate one. The etiquette about plain black cloth for the masculine evening costume is quite as severe as it would be for coloured velvets and embroidery, whilst the modern white tie is more rigidly formal than the lace cravat of our ancestors; in fact, the simpler the costume the stricter the rule. The dress of French peasants is much more formal, in the sense of being governed by rigid custom, than the far more varied dress of the upper classes. We find formal strictness going with simplicity in the Anglican vestments before the days of ritualism, and extreme liberty of artistic design permitted by the Church of

Formalism in Simplicity.

Liberty in Variety.

some of the sacerdotal caste saved themselves in a punt, with their cocks and hens.' "

Rome in the ornamentation of mitre, chasuble, and cope. When Leo XIII. received many thousand chasubles as jubilee gifts, it is probable that there were not two of them alike. Again, in matters of usage it is quite as much a form to put incumbent, curate, and clerk in tiers one above another as to assign to them any other places that might be fixed by the ritual. Therefore, between one form and another, one costume and another, there is little difference as to the reality of formalism. The difference is in the degree of attention given to the matter. Just at first, when a more splendid ritual is adopted, as it has been by some Anglican clergymen, the change may be evidence of a formal spirit, but the same splendours would signify little or nothing if they were traditional and familiar.

Variety of Roman Vestments.

Old-fashioned Anglican Formalism.

Effect of Use and Habit.

This marks the difference between England and France with regard to ritual. In England it has recently been a subject of controversy and of conscious attention, whereas in France the instinct that desires it has always been abundantly satisfied by the Church of Rome, so that there has been no thought about it, and there is no such thing as a consciously ritualistic party. The gorgeous Roman ritual is enjoyed by those who have the instinctive need of it, whilst most people, even unbelievers, consider it natural in a great religion. The ultra-simplicity of French Protestantism is certainly not natural. It is an intentional contrast due to the effect of schism; it is dogmatic dissent expressing itself by external dissimilarity.

No Ritualistic Party in France.

Simplicity of French Protestantism.

All varieties of formalism have one quality in

common, that the strength they give to religion is not vital, it is only social and external. They have a weakening effect upon faith, even in the faithful. Formalism lowers the temperature, not on one side only, but all round it, like an iceberg floating in the sea. Its disapproval of dissent is accompanied by a chilling want of sympathy with religious earnestness and zeal. Formalism is to faith what etiquette is to affection; it is merely taste, and it is quite as much a violation of taste to have the motives of a really genuine, pious Christian, and avow them (in religious language, "to confess Christ before men"), as it is to abstain from customary ceremonies. In short, formalism is the world with its usages, substituting itself for Jesus and his teaching; it is "good form" set up in the place of enthusiastic loyalty and uncalculating self-devotion.

Chilling Effect of Formalism.

Formalism only Taste.

# PART V.

## VIRTUES.

## CHAPTER I.

### TRUTH.

THE Special Committee of the London School Board issued a report in the early part of the year 1888, in which it declared that "fearless truth, bravery, honour, activity, manly skill, temperance, hardihood," were objects of national education. Novelties in Education.

Some of these are very remarkable novelties in education, and if such a scheme should ever be carried into practice, it will produce unprecedented results. Fearless truth, bravery, and honour (if moral courage is understood to be a part of bravery) have usually been represented in education by their opposites, that is to say, by mental submission, by the timidity of the boy who expects to be browbeaten, and by the hypocritical expression of dictated opinions. The individuality of the boy and his honesty have not been encouraged, but repressed. He has been told what to think and what to say, and even what line of argument to follow, without pausing to consider whether he had any intellect or any conscience of his own. I remember a striking instance of this in the case of a French boy who was preparing an essay as a pupil of the philosophy class in a public Repression of Individuality. Dictated Opinions. Case of a French Boy.

school. We talked over the subject of his essay, and I thought he expressed his opinions, which were also mine, with great cogency and clearness. "There," I said, "you have all that is wanted for your essay; why not say what you think in that manner?" He answered, "If I were to write like that, my essay would not be received, and I should get no marks. On all philosophical questions we are to express the opinions that are determined for us by the traditions of the University, so I shall say the contrary of what I think, and then I shall get marks." This training of boys in intellectual dishonesty may be of the greatest value to them in after life, for in real life nothing is so useful to a man as to be able to profess, on occasion, the contrary of what he thinks, but surely it must rob education of all interest even for the educator, seeing that, as he does not hear the truth from his pupils, he can never adapt his reasoning to their case. He does not know their case.

Training in Intellectual Dishonesty.

"But," it will be objected, "if you allow boys to express their crude opinions, it would be encouraging liberty of thought." No, it would only be encouraging honesty of expression, the "fearless truth," the "honour" of the School Board Committee. There is a happy provision of nature by which freedom of thought is, and always has been, the assured possession of every one who values it, only honesty of expression can be put down. You cannot make boys or men think otherwise than as they do think, but you may train them in habits of dissimulation.

Dread of Liberty of Thought.

That Liberty ensured by Nature.

One of the worst of these habits is that of sham admiration in literature and art, and this is a pre-

Sham Admiration in

valent vice of the French mind. There may be some exceptions, but the general rule is that a Frenchman will profess to admire what he thinks he ought to admire, even when he has no genuine ardour of admiration at his disposal. The effect is to make conversations with Frenchmen uninteresting so soon as they turn upon famous masters. They will repeat the old laudatory commonplaces, and if you venture upon any criticism with the slightest originality in it, they will look upon you as an insular eccentric. They have been taught at school how to praise the famous men, they have been taught even the proper terms of laudation. I believe the Chinese learn to repeat the praises of their classics in the same way.

Literature and Art.

A prevalent Vice of the French Mind.

The Chinese.

My own experience leads me to the conclusion that there is less of this sham admiration in England than in France. I grant that the English are often sham admirers of Shakespeare, and that the pretence to appreciate the national poet is not good for the habit of veracity, but I should say that any Englishman who was accustomed to reading would, as a rule, say truly what he thought of modern authors. I would not trust much to his honesty about the Greek and Latin classics, because the admiration of these is mixed up with ideas of culture and of caste. Mr. James Payn says that the habit of literary lying is almost universal in England. The temptation to it is certainly very strong. It is the same temptation that induces painters to over-colour for the exhibitions. Writing which guards and keeps the delicacy of an exquisite honesty, writing which says exactly what the writer feels, and refuses to go beyond his

Less sham Admiration in England than in France.

The Classics.

The Temptation to Literary Lying.

feeling, such writing can rarely appear forcible, especially in comparison with work that is done for force alone without any regard for truth. It will certainly seem weak if it comes after exaggerated writing on the same subject, and it is liable to be eclipsed at any time by coarser work that may be done afterwards. This is especially the case with regard to the criticism or appreciation of great men. The public likes to hear them loudly praised, and easily acquires a sort of partisan loyalty to their names even when it cares nothing for their work. To offend this partisan loyalty is to set it against ourselves, but there is no risk in judicious lying.

Apparent Weakness of Honest Work.

Partisan Loyalty.

Sentence of a Court at Ipswich.

I cannot but think that the sentence of the court at Ipswich on George Frederick Wilfrid Ellis was excessively severe. He was condemned to seven years' penal servitude for having pretended to be a clergyman of the Church of England. For five years he lived as Rector of Wetheringsett, and appears to have given perfect satisfaction in that capacity. He did no perceptible harm in that parish, for even the marriages that he solemnised are valid in English law. He only lied systematically and acted a part to perfection, that was all. But systematic lying is constantly practised by unbelieving laymen who conform outwardly, and they, too, act their part with skill. They may also, like the false Rector of Wetheringsett, often derive great pecuniary advantages from their falsehood, either by getting rich wives or lucrative situations that would be refused to them if their real opinions were known. Yet instead of being condemned to seven years' hard labour as the sham

Systematic Lying.

Handsomely rewarded.

clergyman was, these sham Christians get nothing but rewards for their lying. It becomes, therefore, an important question, in estimating the general truthfulness of a country, whether religious hypocrisy is encouraged in it or not, and to what degree. Is this kind of lying more encouraged in England or in France?

Having touched upon this question elsewhere, I need not dwell upon it here, but will give results only, in a few words. There cannot be a doubt that the kind of lying which belongs to outward conformity is, on the whole, a more useful accomplishment in England than in France. Of the extent to which it is practised we know little. Sham Christians pass for real Christians, and bear no outward mark by which they may be detected. It is certain, however, that the English are becoming much more outspoken than they used to be, and that the quality of "fearless truth" is gaining in esteem amongst them, whilst hypocrisy is considered less meritorious. As for the vulgar French idea that all Englishmen are hypocrites, it may be dismissed with the answer that a majority has no motive for hypocrisy, which is the vice of vituperated minorities. And again, with reference to French truthfulness and courage in the expression of heterodox religious opinion, I admire it, and consider it far preferable to hypocrisy and moral cowardice, but at the same time I remember that a Frenchman has less to risk and less to lose by veracity than an Englishman. A Frenchman can with difficulty conceive the force of that quiet pressure which is

Value of Hypocrisy in England and France.

"Fearless Truth" gaining in English Estimation.

French Truthfulness.

brought to bear upon an Englishman from his infancy. It is like hydraulic pressure, gentle and slow, but practically irresistible. He is taught and governed in boyhood by clergymen, their feminine allies compel him to go to church and to observe the English Sunday if he intends to marry in England. There is the discipline, too, of the daily family prayers, the Scripture readings, and the discipline of "good form" in conversation. Even the strong-minded Englishman is a little afraid of a clergyman. I once knew an English officer in Paris, a man of tried courage, who was not proof against this timidity. He possessed in his library a number of heterodox books, but when a clerical brother from England came to stay with him he packed up all that literature and sent it elsewhere for the time, as a boy puts a forbidden volume out of his master's sight.*

Power of the English Clergy.

Discipline of Society.

English Fear of the Clergy.

Political Lying.

Political lying must be very common in both countries, if we accept the testimony of the politicians themselves, for they always tell us that the newspapers opposed to their own are remarkable chiefly for their mendacity. This field of political lying is far too extensive for me to enter upon it. I prefer to confine myself to a few examples of international misrepresentation, as they will throw light upon the general subject of this book. Like political parties, the nations themselves are enemies, and consider it a legitimate part of the chronic warfare that is

International Misrepresentation.

* *"L'Angleterre est instruite, élevée, gouvernée par ses clergymen."*—PHILIPPE DARYL.

maintained between them to say whatever may be to each other's disadvantage, provided only that it has a chance of being believed.

Difference between English and French Lying.

I notice, however, a difference in kind and quality between French and English lying. The French are daring enough, but they are not really clever in the art. They have much audacity, but little skill. They will say what is not true with wonderful decision, and they will stick to it afterwards; but the English surpass them infinitely in craft and guile. The typical French lie is a simple, shameless invention; the typical English lie is not merely half a truth; it is entangled with half a dozen truths, or semblances of truths, so that it becomes most difficult to separate them, unless by the exercise of great patience and judicial powers of analysis. Besides this, if the patient analyst came and put the falsehood on one side, and the semblances of truth on the other, the process of separation would be too long, too minute, and too wearisome, for a heedless world to follow him.

Superiority of English Craft.

French Reliance on Ignorance.

The French writer who publishes a falsehood always relies greatly upon the ignorance of his readers. He is audacious because he believes himself to be safe from detection; or he may be merely reckless in his statements, without intentional mendacity, knowing that any degree of carelessness is of little consequence in addressing his own careless public. The English writer, on the other hand, is aware that *his* public knows a little of everything, though its knowledge is inexact; and he pays some deference

English Reference to imperfect Knowledge.

to this sort of inexact knowledge by referring to those facts that an indolent and confused memory may retain. His assertions have therefore a sufficiently good appearance both of truth and of knowledge, and they satisfy a public that has some information and a great theoretical respect for truth combined with much critical indolence.

A French Example.

The first example I shall give is of the reckless French kind. The critic has malevolent feelings towards England (the shadow cast by his French patriotism), and he indulges these feelings to the utmost by writing what is unfavourable to the country he detests, without stopping to inquire if it is true.

Toussenel.

Toussenel is a very popular French author. His name is known to every Frenchman who reads, and he has a great reputation for wit. His book entitled *L'Esprit des Bêtes* appeared first in the year 1847, and is now almost a French classic. I find the following paragraph on page 35 of Hetzel's popular edition. After speaking of the horse in past times, Toussenel directs our attention to the present:—

*L'Esprit des Bêtes.*

Toussenel on the English Blood-horse.

"Which is the country in Europe where the blood-horse plays the most brilliant part? It is England. Why? The horse continues to reign and govern in England because England is the country of all the world where oppression is most odious and most revolting. There we find a thousand Norman families which possess, by themselves, all the soil, which occupy all posts, and make all the laws, exactly as on the day after the Battle of Hastings.

In England the conquering race is everything, the rest of the nation nothing. The English lord esteems his horse in proportion to the contempt he has for the Irishman, for the Saxon, inferior races that he has vanquished by his alliance with his horse. Take good heed, then, that you offend not one hair of the tail of a noble courser of Albion, you who care for your money and your liberty; for the horse is the appanage of the House of Lords, and these Lords have caused the law to declare their horse inviolable and sacred. You may knock down a man with your fist, you may take your wife to market with a halter round her neck, you may trail the wretched prostitute in the mud of the gutter, the daughter of the poverty-stricken artisan whom misery has condemned to infamy. The law of Great Britain tolerates these peccadilloes. For the Norman race of Albion, the English people has never formed part of humanity."

Toussenel on English Law.

What strikes us at once in writing of this kind is the astonishing confidence of the author in the profound ignorance of his readers. The confidence was fully justified. There are few Frenchmen even at the present day to whom anything in this passage would seem inaccurate or exaggerated. The statement that only the Norman families can be lords and landowners is quite one that the French mind would be prepared to accept, because it implies that England is in a more backward condition than France. I have met with an intelligent Frenchman who maintained that serfdom still exists in England —the serfdom of the Saxon, the serfdom of Gurth

Norman Families.

Serfdom in England.

and Wamba; and when I happened to mention an English estate as belonging to a certain commoner, another Frenchman, a man of superior culture and gentle breeding, first looked politely sceptical, and then raised the unanswerable objection that in England, as everybody knew, land could only be held by peers. Others will repeat Toussenel's statement that all the public posts (what we call *places*) are held by the nobility.

Peers the only Landowners.

Toussenel's Kind of Falsehood.

The kind of falsehood of which Toussenel's statements are an example arises from complete indifference to truth. He pays no attention to it whatever, has no notion that a writer who fails to inform himself neglects a sacred duty, but sets down in malice any outrageous idea that comes uppermost, and then affirms it to be fact.

My next example is of less importance, because it is not spread abroad in a famous and permanent book; still, it shows a kind of falsehood that may be dictated by French malevolence. A Frenchman had been staying in England, and on his return to France he told any one who would listen to him that the English have a strange custom—the family bath. All the members of an English family, without regard to sex or age, bathe together every morning in a state of perfect nudity.

The English Family Bath.

Cause of the Lie.

This, I think, is rather a representative specimen of a French lie. It is a pure invention, suggested by anger at the superior cleanliness of the English upper classes, and by a desire to make them pay

for their cleanliness by a loss of reputation for decency.

By reckless invention on the one hand, and complete carelessness about verification on the other, the French have accumulated a mass of information about the English which is as valuable as the specimens here given. But there is no real interest in the study of artless French mendacity. It is but the inventiveness of children who say no matter what. It displays no intelligence. English falsehood is incomparably superior to it as an exercise of mental sharpness, and is always worth studying as an inexhaustible subject for the most watchful and interesting analysis. Nothing can surpass the ingenuity with which that marvellous patchwork of truth and its opposite is put together. The intelligent Englishman knows that truth is the most important ingredient in a well-concocted falsehood.

French Mendacity Artless.

English Falsehood Intellectually Superior.

The following example has remained in my memory, and is worth quoting for its concentration. In scarcely more than twenty words it contains three deceptive phantoms of truths, and conveys three false impressions. I found it in an English newspaper of repute, but am unable to give the date. This, however, is in some degree indicated by the passage itself.

"The present atheistical government of France, after expelling the religious orders, has now decreed that the crosses shall be removed from the cemeteries."

An Example of English Falsehood.

The adjective "atheistical" is here quietly sub-

Analysis of the

Example given.

stituted for the true one, which would be *laïc*. The French Government is not more atheistic than a board of railway directors. There are four antagonistic established religions in France, and the right to freedom of thought is recognised by law,* so that a French Government is necessarily non-theocratic and neutral. French cabinets no more profess atheism than they profess Judaism or Romanism; and since the establishment of the Third Republic they have never shown themselves more actively hostile to the idea of Deity than the Royal Society or any other purely secular institution in London.

French Cabinets *laïc*.

The Religious Orders.

The expression, "after expelling the religious orders," was intended to convey the idea that the religious orders *in general* were expelled *from France*, that being the recognised English view of the Ferry decrees. In reality not a single monk was expelled from France, nor were the orders generally disturbed in any way. The religious orders were classed under two categories,—the authorised, which were recognised by the State, and the unauthorised, which existed only on sufferance. The laws, which required them to ask for "authorisation," had not been passed under the republic but under the

* An essential difference between France and England. "No one," says Professor Dicey, "can maintain that the law of England recognises anything like that natural right to the free communication of thoughts and opinions which was proclaimed in France nearly a hundred years ago to be one of the most valuable rights of man."—*The Law of the Constitution*, first edition, pp. 257, 258.

monarchy. What happened in 1880 was this. The authorised congregations were left entirely undisturbed. The unauthorised were not expelled from France, but invited to ask for an authorisation, which the Government was disposed to grant in every case except that of the Jesuits. They declined to ask, in obedience to commands from Rome, the object of which was to place the Government in the position of a persecutor, or compel it to retreat. Ferry would not retreat, and turned the unauthorised congregations out of their houses. This was represented as a persecution of religion; but, in truth, the monks *were treated exactly as French laymen,* for unauthorised associations of laymen were equally illegal, and lay associations were equally obliged to submit their statutes and ask for authorisation.* Sir Robert Peel said in 1843, "If a Church chooses to have the advantages of an establishment, and to hold those pri-

What happened in 1880.

Action of the Ferry Cabinet.

Laymen under the same Law.

Sir Robert Peel's Opinion.

* The ordinary law about associations was declared by some English journals to be "obsolete," and revived only for persecution. It was so little obsolete that it was steadily applied to lay associations. I was at one time an honorary member of a French club limited to eighteen in order that an "authorisation" might not be required; and I have been vice-president of another club, not limited in numbers, so that we had to send our statutes to be approved by the prefect, and whenever the slightest change was made in them they had to be submitted again to the same authority. It was a very simple formality, costing three sous for a postage stamp. Had we acted like the unauthorised religious orders, which declined to submit to this not very terrible piece of tyranny, we should have been dissolved as they were, and turned out of our club-house as they were turned out of their establishments.

Law about Associations not Obsolete.

vileges which the law confers, that Church, whether it be the Church of Rome, or the Church of England, or the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, *must conform to the law.*" The French cabinet was therefore only acting upon a recognised English principle.

Removal of the Crosses from the Cemeteries.

We may next examine the statement that the French Government ordered the crosses to be removed from the cemeteries. If the reader does not know the truth he is sure to receive the intended impression that this order, emanating from the Government, took effect throughout France. He will receive another impression, well calculated upon, that the crosses *upon the graves* were removed. In fact, this is what the English believed about the matter. What an unholy outrage on Christianity and on the feelings of pious relatives! What a perfect subject for indignant denunciation of republican tyranny and violence! However, English travellers still find the crosses on the graves, and they see the stone-cutters near the cemeteries continually carving new ones under their wooden sheds.

English Belief about it.

The True History about the Crosses.

The explanation is very simple. The decree did not issue from the French Government at all, but from the town council of a single city—Paris. Even in Paris it had no application to the graves, but referred exclusively to the crosses on the gateways of the Parisian cemeteries. These crosses, which were very few in number, the municipal council decided to remove, because they appeared to indicate that Christians alone (or, perhaps, even Roman Catholics alone) had a right to interment in the public burial-

grounds, whereas these were in fact open to Jews and unbelievers as well as to Catholics and Protestants.

Now, I would ask the reader to observe in how few words the false impressions are conveyed and how many have been needed for a reply. And how can one count upon the sustained attention necessary for the reception of the truth?

English Newspapers and French Religious Orders.

The English newspapers quite succeeded in conveying the impression that the religious congregations were expelled from France, as if they had been sent into exile. Since then there has been a second case of turning-out, and when it occurred I observed with great interest what the English press would make of it and what the English public could be induced to believe. Until the Duke of Aumale wrote an intentionally offensive letter to the President of the Republic, in a form which no Head of a State would have tolerated, only two members of the House of Orleans had been expelled—the Count of Paris and the Duke of Orleans. The English newspapers, in order to augment the appearance of tyranny on the part of the French Government, had the ingenuity to pervert this into an expulsion of the entire Orleans family, ladies, children, and all. The ladies and children were introduced to win the sympathy of the reader, and arouse his indignation against the republican persecutors. The daily papers announced the expulsion of the Orleans family in capital letters, but the best appeal to sympathy was made by the illustrated journals, which impartially

The Expulsion of the Princes.

English Perversion of the Truth.

The Illustrated Journals.

engraved portraits of them all as interesting and illustrious exiles. Nor was this fiction temporary. The false legend which the English people seriously believe has already entered into history. See how neatly and briefly it is inserted in the following extract from the *Saturday Review* for 9th July 1887: "About the time of the expulsion of himself *and his family* from France, the Count of Paris advised his friends to abandon the practice of indiscriminate opposition." Meanwhile, as a matter of fact, members of the house supposed to be languishing in exile were enjoying full liberty in France, travelling, staying, and receiving any guests they pleased.

Extract from the *Saturday Review*.

English Story about a French Catechism.

In the year 1886 some English newspapers got up an account of a sort of French catechism, using the name of Mr. Matthew Arnold as an authority. The nature of this catechism may be understood from a speech at the Harvard celebration by Mr. Lowell, who trusted to these statements. Here are Mr. Lowell's words: "Mr. Matthew Arnold has told us that in contemporary France, which seems doomed to try every theory of enlightenment by which the fingers may be burned or the house set on fire, the children of the public schools are taught, in answer to the question, 'Who gives you all these fine things?' to say, 'The State.' Ill fares the State in which the parental image is replaced by an abstraction."

Children in the French Public Schools.

The Author's Inquiry into the Matter.

Being well aware of the extreme skill with which false impressions are conveyed in England, I said to myself that it would be interesting to institute a little

inquiry into this matter, and did not rest till I had got to the bottom of it. "The public schools" is a very comprehensive expression, including and at once suggesting the *lycées,* so I began my inquiry in them. The result was as I expected; no such question and answer were known in the *lycées,* or had ever been heard of there. My next move was to cause inquiries to be made in the elementary schools. There, also, the question and answer were wholly unknown; but the masters added that since many manuals were used, no single manual being imposed by the Government, as implied by the newspaper statement, there might possibly be some school in which a manual might contain something resembling the question and answer quoted. Its Results.

Finally, I wrote to Mr. Arnold himself, hoping to get from him the little scrap of truth on which the falsehood had grown. Mr. Arnold could not give me the name of any school in which anything resembling that question and answer had been heard; he only remembered that "in some school in Paris" he had made a note of the matter. Finally, Mr. Arnold frankly acknowledged that the word "State" (*l'État*) was not used at all. The word really used was *le Pays,* which is not an abstraction but a reality —the land of France with all its inhabitants. The question and answer seemed to Mr. Arnold to exhibit "the superficiality, nay silliness, of the French in treating religion and morals." I see in it nothing but a truthful account of a matter of fact. The children were reminded that they owed their educa- Mr. Arnold's Answer. A Simple Fact.

tion to the country as a reason for serving the country when the time came.

Scott's Denial of the Authorship of *Waverley*.

Sir Walter Scott has often been severely blamed for defending the anonymous character of the Waverley novels by falsehoods, but he would not have been blamed for defending it by silence, even when silence was fully equivalent to a falsehood. This opens an important question in casuistry. It is likely that almost all French people would say that Sir Walter had a right to defend himself in that way, as the falsehood in self-defence against curiosity is usually considered legitimate in France. Many English people do not think that kind of falsehood legitimate, yet would practise the silence that deceives, or utter a sentence carefully worded so as to be literally true whilst it conveyed an erroneous idea. Everybody defends himself against impertinent curiosity in his own way, and it can seldom be done without some sacrifice of veracity. When Robert Chambers said he wondered how the author of *Vestiges of Creation* would have felt under Herschell's attack, it was not true, he did not wonder, he knew accurately, being himself the author.

Lying in Self-defence.

Defences against Impertinent Curiosity. Robert Chambers.

French Opinion about English Truth.

English Opinion about French Truth. The Author's Experience.

The French believe the English to be usually truthful in private transactions, but slippery and deceitful in great international affairs; the English have very little confidence in French truth, either in private or public matters. For my part, I have met with extremely deceitful and extremely honourable men in both countries. I have been cheated in both, and treated fairly and justly in both. If, however,

I were asked to say which of the two nations is according to my own intimate convictions the more truthful, I should say decidedly the English, except on religious topics, and there the French are more truthful, or, if you will, more unreserved.

## CHAPTER II.

### JUSTICE.

Intellectual Justice.

WHAT is meant by "justice" in this chapter is the power of suspending judgment until evidence is forthcoming, and then the disposition to decide on the merits of the case unbiassed by prepossessions of any kind. It is one of the rarest, perhaps the very rarest, of intellectual virtues, and hardly ever to be found in times of strife, either between nations or between parties in the same nation.

Little of it in France.

It would be a proof of ignorance of human nature to expect much of this virtue in contemporary France, a country divided, more than any other in Europe, by political and religious animosity. And, in fact, there is very little intellectual justice in France, the only men who cultivate the virtue being a few thoughtful philosophers who have little influence in the nation. I may mention Guyau as a representative of this small class.* He certainly endeavoured to think

Guyau.

* Author of *L'Irréligion de l'Avenir*, *Esquisse d'une Morale sans Obligation ni Sanction*, *Les Problèmes de l'Esthétique Contemporaine*, *La Morale d'Epicure et ses Rapports avec les Doctrines Contemporaines*, etc. Guyau died in 1888 at the age of thirty-three.

justly, which is one of several reasons for regretting his premature death. I myself have known two or three Frenchmen in private life who have the same desire to be just.

Justice Commoner in England than in France.

The English are more favourably situated for the cultivation of this virtue, and, in fact, it is more frequently found amongst them; but the English themselves have entered upon a period of strong political dissension since the Irish question reached an acute stage, and even if that question were settled there are others beyond it which are not less likely to produce great intensity of party hatred. There will not be much justice whilst these dissensions continue. Even so ordinary an occurrence as a simple parliamentary election is now enough to divide the society of an English country town into hostile camps almost as bitter as French parties. What is most to be deplored is that some of the philosophers themselves, who might be expected to keep cool heads, have caught the contagion exactly like ordinary mortals.

Party Dissensions in England.

Even amongst Philosophers.

Independently of political questions, the commonest cause of injustice in England is to be found in the ideas of class. The class of gentlemen has a tendency to give its sympathy, without question, to gentlemen, and to refuse it to those who are not, in its opinion, of that caste. One of the best examples of this tendency was the unanimity of the English gentry in their sympathy with the slaveholders during the American war of secession, purely on the ground that the slaveholders were a gentlemanly class. In

Class Ideas.

Sympathy with the Slaveholders.

comparison with this important point, the injustice of slavery itself sank into complete insignificance. The same rule of sympathy for gentlemen extends to the continent of Europe, although the gentlemen there are often of a very dubious species. Anybody who would put down French popular aspirations was sure of class sympathy in England. A French republican is simply a Frenchman who desires representative government, that is what he is; but class-antipathy set English gentlefolks against him, though they themselves had been the first to profit by representative institutions in their own country. So with regard to French conflicts between Church and State, the English upper classes always side instinctively with the Church, although they themselves accepted Church property after the great English spoliation, and many of them are still living upon it, some actually in the very walls of the old abbeys, others within sight of their ruins, whilst others, again, appropriate tithes. If a French mayor prohibits a religious procession it is an act of republican tyranny, yet Roman Catholic processions are not permitted in English streets, and the republicans do not carry their distrust of the clergy so far as to make them ineligible for the Chamber of Deputies as they are for the House of Commons. Neither is a French priest compelled to lay aside his ecclesiastical costume except when he goes to England. However, polite English sympathy with the Church of Rome has one incontestable merit; it is at the same time disinterested and unrequited. The Rev. Father du Lac, who took his

Antipathy to French Republicans.

English Sympathy with the Church of Rome.

Father du Lac.

Jesuit school to Canterbury after the Ferry decrees, and who enjoys British protection, calls Queen Victoria a monstrous anomaly, the anomaly being that royalty and heresy are monstrously combined in the person of Her Majesty.*

Queen Victoria a "Monstrous Anomaly."

The sharp separation of classes produces much injustice within the limits of England itself. When an Englishman feels himself authorised to despise his equal in wealth, culture, and wisdom, if he happens to be a dissenter, there is a strong temptation to do so, and we find public writers in England who quietly look down upon all dissenters *en bloc* as people of low caste and unrefined manners. After all, these wretched dissenters are Englishmen and Englishwomen, which is surely some title to consideration.

Injustice produced by Class Ideas in England itself.

I am far from wishing to imply that the English never rise above the region of class prejudices. Many have done so, and these amongst the most distinguished. Shelley did so completely, Byron partially; in our own day several of the most famous poets

Superiority of many English People to Class Prejudices.

* The reverend father is speaking of Her Majesty's visit to the Grande Chartreuse, which she was able to make by taking advantage of an ancient rule made before the Church could foresee the monstrous anomaly of an heretical king or queen. By that rule, which still remains in force, a bishop or a reigning sovereign can visit a house of cloistered monks or nuns. The Archbishop of Canterbury could, however, scarcely get into a nunnery, as the Rev. Father du Lac informs us that the ancient English sees were erased by Pius IX. from the list of the bishoprics of Christendom.

Class Prejudices amongst theFrench.

and thinkers appear to live, intellectually at least, outside of class. My impression is that the French do not get rid of class prejudices so frequently as the English. If they belong either to the real or the false *noblesse* they think that *noblesse oblige* in a peculiar sense, that it lays them under an obligation to condemn popular aspirations without a hearing.

Comparative Mental Independence of the Poor.

It is difficult for the poor in any country to be just, because they so often suffer; still, in France, they are more frequently independent in their judgments than the upper classes, the proof being that they support a greater variety of opinions. You never know how a French peasant will vote till you know him individually, but you may predict to a certainty that a noble will vote against the republican candidate.

Whether, in quieter and more settled times, French parties will be less virulent, must depend upon the effects of experience. The events of the next decade may have either a calming or an exasperating influence. I do not perceive that parties have become more tolerant during the last ten years. The one good sign is, that with all their hatred they have avoided civil war.

French Parties not becoming more Tolerant.

Vulgar Patriotism.

Next to the rancour of internal politics, the greatest obstacle to justice is that kind of vulgar patriotism which cannot love its own country without hating its neighbours. This sentiment of hatred is strictly proportionate to the neighbour's power. The English have no animosity against Swiss republicanism, though

Hatred of Powerful Neighbours.

it is still more democratic than French. The French had a romantic sympathy with Italy in her weakness, but they detest her in her strength.

Most English and French people are capable of justice towards foreigners who belong to insignificant States, such as the Danes, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Swiss, and the Greeks. A few are capable of justice towards citizens of great and powerful States.

Justice to Citizens of Insignificant States.

Mr. Grant Allen has given an excellent example of this rare kind of justice in saying simply what is true about the French colony of Algeria, and in expressing the desire, in the interests of civilisation, that the beneficent French power might ultimately be permitted to extend itself over Morocco. I remember that when the fate of Gordon at Khartoum was still unsettled, some Frenchmen expressed a hearty desire for his preservation and success. They considered that he represented civilisation against barbarism, and placed themselves on the side of civilisation.

Mr. Grant Allen just to the French about Algeria.

French Sympathy with Gordon at Khartoum.

I have occasionally met with French people who tried to be just even to the Germans, and that, of course, is very hard for them, but the great majority are unable to look upon war as a simple game in which the loser pays the penalty. They think of it as a glorious enterprise when they win, and as a cruel inhuman outrage when they are defeated.

French Feeling about War.

It is a part of strict justice to see the defects of one's own country as plainly as those of another. This is certainly not incompatible with strong affec-

The Defects of one's own Country.

tion, as in private life we see very plainly the defects of those whom we love well and faithfully, and for whom we are ready to make the utmost sacrifices. In this way a few Englishmen see clearly the defects of England, but I should say that many more Frenchmen see clearly and justly the defects of France. I have heard severe criticisms of France from English people, but far more telling and formidable criticisms from the French themselves, because they knew the weak points and could criticise in detail. This is especially true with regard to the defects of French administration, apparently so perfect and looking so laboriously after centimes, yet in reality unable to prevent either waste or corruption.

French Criticisms of France.

The natural refuge of justice ought to be in the press, but unfortunately, as I have observed elsewhere, justice is not a very convenient or acceptable quality in literature, and least of all in journalism. Its constant tendency is to diminish the display of what people foolishly take for literary force, and to make what might otherwise have been called forcible writing seem dull and commonplace. Now, the French journalist may be wildly inaccurate, he may be wrong in all his statements, and give suppositions in the place of facts, but he cannot afford to be dull, as he addresses readers whose chief peculiarity, as he well knows, is to be inattentive. Wit and exaggeration are the baits by which the French reader is to be caught, but wit is seldom just, and exaggeration never is. There was poor John Brown, the Queen's domestic, I will not say what the French

Inconvenience of Justice in Literature.

Baits for the French Reader.

press made of him, but in the exercise of its Gallic sharpness it got a good way beyond the truth. French writers are rather fond of laughing at the Queen, as English writers have laughed at various foreign sovereigns, and sometimes the laugh is harmless yet based on inaccurate information. For example, M. Philippe Daryl says that after a drawing-room "la reine remonte dans son carrosse à six chevaux café-au-lait, de race hanovrienne comme elle, et prend le chemin de Windsor." This is a French fiction, intended to make the Queen a little ridiculous; the Frenchman is trotting out the cream-coloured horses (they are eight, not six) for the occasion, and despatches them on the road to Windsor. As a matter of fact the Queen travels to Windsor by rail, and usually drives to the Paddington Station behind four bays, so that the whole pleasantry falls rather flat on an English reader. It is a trifle, but it may serve to illustrate the position of a French writer who must be amusing at all costs.

Gallic Sharpness.

M. Philippe Daryl.

His Invention about the Queen.

The great writers are in the same position with a difference. They need not amuse; but they are bound to provide a stirring stimulus. Was Victor Hugo a just writer? Was Carlyle? They knew their business, which was to be forcible; but nobody who understood their nature, or their art either, would go to Victor Hugo for a faithful account of the English, or to Carlyle for an exact appreciation of the French. Or shall we turn to Michelet and Ruskin?—both makers of delightful prose, but too much biassed by their own genius to be just. In literature force and

Great Writers not Just.

Sparkle and Glitter more Valuable than Justice.

brilliance, nay, even mere glassy sparkle or glitter of tinsel, are more effective qualities than the hesitancy that cannot round off a sentence without stopping to inquire whether the praise in it is not too much for the occasion, or the censure undeserved.

Suppose that a just writer were asked to give, in five or six lines, his opinion of the railway system, and its action for good and evil, how would he describe it?

A just Account of Railways.

He might say, "The use of railways is to transport merchandise and passengers quickly and cheaply. They favour human intercourse by enabling people to meet in spite of distance, and to exchange letters without delay. They are sometimes, to a limited extent, injurious to beautiful scenery. Railway travelling is sometimes injurious to health; and railway accidents occasionally cause loss of life."

This is exactly just and true; but it has the fatal defect of being commonplace. It is also quite destitute of sublimity. Now listen to Mr. Ruskin on the same subject.

A Powerful Description of Railways.

"They are to me the loathsomest form of devilry now extant, animated and deliberate earthquakes, destructive of all wise social habits and possible natural beauty, carriages of damned souls on the ridges of their own graves."

These lines have several most valuable literary qualities. They give a shock of surprise, they captivate attention, they entirely avoid the quagmire of the commonplace. They introduce very sublime elements, the Miltonic elements of devilry, earth-

Analysis of Mr. Ruskin's Description.

quakes, and lost spirits. There is, too, a mysterious grandeur about the damned souls who take railway tickets and travel over their own corpses buried in the embankments. But is this account of railways accurate and true? Is it just to the memory of George Stephenson?

---

## CHAPTER III.

### PURITY.

Difficulty of the Subject.

Of all subjects this is the most difficult to treat satisfactorily; because there is, and must be, an inevitable reticence that is sure to weaken the argument at the most important points. Besides this, the subject, more than any other, is steeped in conventionalisms, some of which it is considered right or pardonable to act upon, but not pardonable to express. There are tacit tolerations which it is an offence to avow, as if the avowal incurred a new and personal responsibility. And even the most frank and courageous of writers might well shrink from a subject that cannot be fully discussed, at least in an English book.

Conventionalisms.

Tacit Tolerations.

There is, however, one point of great importance which has never, so far as I know, been frankly touched upon before, and which may help us to understand the varieties and inconsistencies of public opinion.

We all know that the relation between the sexes is of a dual nature; that it is both physical and mental. A man may be attracted to a woman by a physical impulse, or by a desire for her companion-

ship, or by both at the same time. This we all know and admit; but the fiction of our conventionalism, and a very curious and wonderful fiction it is, excludes one or the other of the two reasons for cohabitation after ascertaining whether it is, or is not, in accordance with received usages. If the cohabitation is not of a customary kind, it is at once assumed that physical pleasure is the only object of it; and that pleasure is spoken of in terms of disgust, as vile, sensual, and degrading. If, however, the cohabitation is of a customary kind, not only is the physical pleasure permitted without reproach, but it is conventionally ignored as non-existent, and the motive for cohabitation is held to be the pure desire for companionship. One of the best examples of this contrast is the different way of regarding the marriage of ecclesiastics in a Catholic and in a Protestant community. An Anglican clergyman gets married, and the incident, being in accordance with custom, conveys no idea to the Protestant mind beyond this—that the clergyman may have felt lonely by himself, and wanted the help, the companionship, the gentle affection of a wife. The physical relation is set aside, it is simply not thought about, and even this slight and passing allusion to it may be condemned as unbecoming. Now let us turn to the state of opinion in Roman Catholic countries. There, when people hear of the marriage of an ecclesiastic, they think of nothing but the physical relation, and they think of it as disgusting, filthy, and obscene, though, in fact, it is simply natural and

Partiality of our Conventionalism.

Two Weights and Two Measures.

Opposite Views of the Marriage of Ecclesiastics.

no more. In this case the desire for companionship is ignored, and physical appetite alone is assumed to be the motive for the union. A case has occurred of a Protestant ecclesiastic, who married after his elevation to a bishopric. I despair of conveying to the English reader any idea of the aspect that such a union must have for Catholics who have never lived amongst Protestants. For them it is not only monstrous as an outrage against custom, but it even seems monstrous in the sense of being unnatural. Something of this Catholic horror remained even in the strong mind of Queen Elizabeth. She was near enough to Catholic times, and had still enough of Catholic sentiment, to be unable to look upon a bishop's wife without loathing.

Marriage of a Bishop.

Catholic Horror.

When custom partly but not entirely tolerates cohabitation, we find the two ideas predominating in different people. Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is, for those who are favourable to it, the desire for affectionate companionship or for motherly tenderness towards children already existing; for those who are unfavourable it is a lust of the flesh. In like manner there are two estimates of the conduct of a divorced woman who marries again during her first husband's lifetime.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.

We may now approach the subject of illegitimate unions. In societies where they are tolerated the idea of companionship prevails; in societies where they are not tolerated the physical aspect of the union immediately suggests itself. In the large towns both of England and France it is not rare

Illegitimate Unions.

Cohabitation in large Towns.

amongst the lower classes for men and women to live together without formal marriage. With reference to these cases the complaint of moralists is that the people have no proper sense of the necessity of marriage, they have not the proper consciousness that they are doing wrong. The reason is that these unions are permitted by the customs of the lower classes, and are scarcely blamed when the man remains faithful to the woman and treats her well; therefore the physical relation is as much ignored as it is in formal marriage, and companionship alone is thought of.

Customs of the Lower Classes.

The same great power of custom, in casting a veil over the grosser side of the sexual relation, is seen in higher classes whenever illicit unions are tolerated by public opinion, and they often are so in the artistic and intellectual classes of great capitals when it is evident that the union is one of genuine companionship, and when it is of a lasting character, and both parties remain at least apparently faithful to it. Here is an expression of this toleration by M. Alfred Asseline, true for Paris, but not true for the provinces. I give it in the original, because the exact shades of expression could not easily be reproduced in a translation.

Illicit Unions in the Artistic and Intellectual Classes.

"Dans l'état où sont nos mœurs, il est admis que les hommes supérieurs ont le privilège d'imposer à ce qu'on appelle le monde, à la société dont ils sont le charme et l'honneur, une amie,—l'amie,—la femme qu'il leur a plu de choisir comme le témoin voilé de leurs travaux, celle qui, légitime ou non, se

Quotation from M. Alfred Asseline.

tient dans l'ombre, confidente discrète du génie, au moment où ses rayons s'allument.

"Ce n'est pas la vulgaire Égérie, c'est la Muse, c'est l'âme même du poète qu'il nous est permis, dans les épanchements de l'amitié, de voir, d'admirer, de respecter."

Careful Exclusion of Impure Ideas.

The reader will observe in these carefully chosen words how deliberately all suggestion of impurity is excluded, and how the writer dwells upon intellectual companionship alone. He may understand this still better by reference to a special case.

Story of Victor Hugo and Juliette Drouet.

About the year 1833 there was an actress at the theatre of the Porte-Saint-Martin, named Juliette Drouet, who performed in two of Victor Hugo's plays, *Lucrèce Borgia* and *Marie Tudor*. The poet was pleased with her performance, and thought well of her intelligence. In this way he was attracted to herself, and she became his mistress, and lived either with him, or very near him, till she died many years afterwards. She had a residence close to his own at Guernsey, which Victor Hugo arranged and decorated. When he returned to Paris she returned with him and continued to be his very near neighbour. It was the fashion in Paris to think only of the intellectual side of this *liaison*, and to speak of Madame Drouet with the utmost respect as the poet's wise and discreet friend, a kind of living Muse for him. The lawful wife herself, who knew all, spoke without bitterness of her rival. "These gentlemen," she said one day to her cousin, meaning her husband and son, "have arranged a little *fête* at Madame

Parisian Opinion on that *liaison*.

Drouet's and they are expecting you. I insist on your going, it will please my husband." When Madame Drouet died, the notices in the newspapers were most respectful to her, and sympathetic with the old poet who had lost "the faithful friend and wise and gentle adviser of so many years." Respectful Tone of the Press.

It will be seen from these extracts that illicit unions may under certain favourable circumstances (especially that of intellectual or artistic companionship) come to be conventionally protected, as marriage itself is, by the use of the purest possible language. There have been cases in London more or less resembling that of Victor Hugo, which it would be considered an offence against good taste to speak about in the plain terms of old-fashioned morality. Protection by the Use of Pure Language.

M. André Theuriet, in his excellent novel *Amour d'Automne,* says that adulterous *liaisons* are conventionally tolerated in Paris, but judged very severely by the stricter provincial opinion. Those who feel disposed to tolerate them, speak of them in words so carefully selected that they may be used before virgins and children. There was "an affectionate friendship" between the gentleman and lady, or "an old attachment." Fidelity in these cases gives them an air of positive virtue:— André Theuriet on Parisian and Provincial Opinion.

"Le temps, vieillard divin, honore et blanchit tout!"

This kind of toleration is not by any means confined to London and Paris; it has long existed in Italy and Germany. Lewes might have counted upon it in Liszt, yet at Weimar he asked if he might Toleration in Italy and Germany. Lewes and Liszt.

Liszt and the Princess of Wittgenstein.

present Miss Evans to the musician, not feeling sure "as their position was irregular." Liszt himself was living at Weimar with the Princess of Wittgenstein, who had left her husband for his sake; and the duke had been so accommodating as to lend them the Altenburg residence, where they dispensed a graceful hospitality to many friends. The long series of Liszt's successes with distinguished ladies did not exclude him from the world of London and Paris.

Great Capitals—their Opinion of each Other.

Every great capital believes that some other great capital is the most vicious in the world. London accords that distinction to Paris, Paris to Vienna, but these accusations are vague, and it is impossible to know the truth. The evidence in the Divorce Courts reveals a little of it now and then, and is good evidence so far as it extends, but it is never published in France. Statistics of prostitution are also admissible as evidence, but it is difficult to found any comparative argument upon them; because, in great cities, there is so much clandestine prostitution, so much eking out of miserable incomes by that means. The decent, modestly-dressed girl, the sad-looking young widow whom nobody suspects, may have yielded to the pressure of want.

Divorce Court Evidence.

Statistics of Prostitution.

Clandestine Prostitution.

I am unable to follow the English habit of taking French novels as evidence of the general corruption of French life, and will give good reasons for this rejection. Before doing so let me observe that I am equally unwilling to believe evil, on insufficient evidence, of the English. For example, I have never

The Author's Unwillingness to believe

attached the slightest weight to what were called the "revelations of the *Pall Mall Gazette*," which all the viler French newspapers affected to believe merely because they would have been, if true, such precious facts for the enemy. Evil on Insufficient Evidence.

The English argument usually assumes one of two forms:— The English Arguments from French Fiction.

1. Novelists draw from life; consequently, as adultery is almost universal in French novels it must be equally common in French life.

2. French people purchase novels about adultery in great numbers; consequently, the readers of these books must commit adultery themselves.

With regard to the first of these propositions, I should say that crimes of all kinds occur more frequently in all imaginative literature than they do in the dull routine of everyday existence. Murder, for example, is much more frequent in *Shakespeare* than it is in ordinary English life. Even stories that are considered innocent enough to be read by the young, such as *The Arabian Nights, Robinson Crusoe,* and, in recent times, Mr. Stevenson's *Treasure Island,* are full of villainy and homicide, introduced for no purpose in the world but to excite the interest of the reader. What would English critics say to a Frenchman who should affirm that there are suicide clubs in England like the mutual murder society described with such circumstantial detail in the *New Arabian Nights?* If we think of a few famous English novels we shall find that they often describe situations which are certainly not common in the ordinary Frequency of Crime in Imaginative Literature. Shakespeare. Stories read by the Young. The Suicide Club.

lives of respectable people like ourselves. We are not generally either bigamists, or seducers, or wife-slayers, yet *Jane Eyre* turned upon an intended bigamy, *Adam Bede* turned upon a case of seduction and infanticide, and *Paul Ferroll* fascinated us by the wonderfully self-possessed behaviour of a gentleman who had quietly murdered his wife, as she lay in bed, early one summer morning. In *Daniel Deronda* the most polished gentleman in the book has a family of illegitimate children, and the most brilliant young lady becomes, in intention, a murderess, whilst the sweetest girl is rescued from attempted suicide. These things *may* happen, which is enough for the purposes of the novelist. In France the great difficulty of that artist is the uninteresting nature of the usual preliminaries of marriage, so that he is thrown back upon adulterous love as the only kind that is adventurous and romantic.

Jane Eyre. Adam Bede. Paul Ferroll. Daniel Deronda.

That Fiction only represents Collected Cases.

The argument that the world of reality must be like the world of fiction fails in another way. Real people are almost infinitely more numerous than the creations of novelists, therefore, if every immoral adventure in novels were drawn from life, it would only prove that the novelist had collected cases, as a medical student might collect cases of disease in a fairly healthy population. As a matter of fact, however, the novelist does not usually take his *incidents* from reality; he will often go to nature for his characters, and to invention for his situations. The material in real life that suggests the stories need not be very abundant. The cases of immorality

Situations often Invented. Materials not necessarily Abundant.

found in the English newspapers alone would be more than enough to keep the principal French novelists at work all the year round.

Novelists a small Class.

The novelists themselves are a small class working under immense temptations. They live in Paris, where life is terribly expensive, rents enormous, habits luxurious. It is part of their business to see society, and that entails an expenditure above the ordinary gains of quiet unsensational literature. The temptation to gain more money is, in such a situation, almost irresistible. Money is to be earned by exciting the reader. Writers for the populace do this chiefly by murders; but murders are not so attractive to the richer and more refined classes as adventures of pleasure and sensuality. The novelist works for his public, and enjoys both a world-wide notoriety and a handsome income. The most successful novelists describe the pleasures of luxury and vice, and the excitement to be derived from their pursuit. They are simply acute tradesmen, like their publishers, who supply what is in demand.

Tempted by Money.

The Reader must be Excited.

Novelists acute Tradesmen.

Now with regard to the second proposition, that the readers of immoral stories must themselves be immoral, observation of actual cases entirely fails to confirm it. People read these stories because they feel dull, and seek the interest of exciting situations. Here is a case well known to me. A lady lives in a very out-of-the-way country house and sees very little society; so reading is her only resource. Fiction is naturally an important part of her reading, and as she is not a linguist she is confined to the works of

Why People read Novels.

Dull Lives.

French authors and a few translations. In this way she has read a good deal about adultery, but her own life is unimpeachable. In like manner, for the sake of a little excitement, an English old maid always read about the murders of the day, and was accurately informed about the horrible details; yet she never murdered anybody, nor even betrayed any homicidal impulse.

An English old Maid.

It is quietly assumed that French novels are written only for the depraved tastes of French readers. French novels are, in fact, the most cosmopolitan of all literatures since the Latin classics. They have a great circulation in Russia, Germany, Italy, England, and other countries. It appears that they answer accurately to the present state of civilisation. In England they are bought by thousands both in the originals and in translations. In a London drawing-room some years ago I found that everybody could talk about Daudet except myself, and this made me read some of his books that I might appear less ignorant. A writer in the *Saturdey Review** speaks of those music halls and restaurants which are chiefly frequented by the *demi-monde,* and then goes on to say: "There is the same fascination in going to these places that there is in reading French novels of more than doubtful morality. Let it be known that there is a book that is hardly decent, and the rush for it is immense amongst our young married ladies, and even among some of the elder spinsters. Indeed,

Cosmopolitan Audience of French Novelists.

Daudet well known in London.

Fashionable Rage for French Novels in England.

* In the number for 23d July 1887.

not to have read any book that is more indecent than usual is to be out of the fashion." This is probably exaggerated, as many books are perfectly decorous in expression whilst depicting an immoral kind of life, and a life may preserve the strictest purity of language though given over to unbridled desires. But, however bad may be the books they read, no one supposes that Englishwomen misconduct themselves in a practical manner because they have read them. Would it be more than fair to extend the same charity to Frenchwomen? It might, at least, be borne in mind that all Frenchwomen are not novel-readers. Many do not read novels at all, others are extremely careful in their choice. All pious women naturally avoid impure literature, and they are a numerous class. Girls are usually limited, in fiction, to translations from English stories and to a few harmless French ones. The habit of novel-reading seems even to vary with localities. The Prefect of the Seine procured some interesting statistics in 1886 about the lending libraries on the outskirts of Paris (for a purpose connected with the budget of the department), and from these it appears that there are the most surprising degrees of variety in the habit of novel-reading in different localities. At Asnières, out of a hundred volumes asked for in the libraries, eighty-six are novels, whilst at St. Denis we find them suddenly falling to twelve in the hundred. At Courbevoie the demand for this class of literature is represented by eighty-two per cent, at St. Ouen by twelve and

Not all French-women Novel-Readers.

Pious Women. Girls.

Statistics of Novel-Reading near Paris.

three-quarters. Other places vary between these extremes.

The *Saturday Review* on Public Education in France.

The *Saturday Review*, never very charitable in its judgments about France, and not often very well informed, has spoken as follows about public education in that country: "France has taken a great step forward in these days. It has gone all the way to an expenditure of ninety millions of francs a year, and although Mr. Matthew Arnold does not say so, has materially added to its now permanent deficit by lavish outlay on schools, in which it trains thousands of children to read." (Well, surely there can be no harm in teaching children to read, but international malevolence is ingenious enough to find evil even here. I resume my suspended quotation:)

How the French use their Knowledge.

"Thousands of children to read who *will never use their knowledge again, or will use it only to read obscenity, to the great and manifest advantage of their minds and morals.*"

This is the kind of information about France which appears to satisfy the readers of the *Saturday Review*. It is on a level with the surprising statements about the English that we find in the most ignorant French newspapers.

What the French Lower Classes read.

The principal reading of the lower classes is the newspapers published at one sou. Some of these are very ably conducted (for example, the *Lyon Républicain*), some others at the same price are much inferior, but the better class of these journals have a great circulation and are doing more good than harm. The inferior ones publish the sort of

Trashy Novels.

trash, in the way of novels, that suits an uncultivated taste. The principal difference between these novels and those read by educated people does not seem to be so much in morality as in the more abundant variety of horrible situations supplied by the writer for the populace. In France, as in England and elsewhere, the desire for excitement which characterises the beginner in reading seems to turn naturally to harrowing scenes. But the poor Frenchman is not confined to his newspaper. He has now plenty of opportunities for purchasing cheap scientific and literary works, and also for borrowing them. The collection of *Cent Bons Livres*, published by Félix Vernay, contains books of both classes issued in a legible type at two sous, and not one of them is immoral. The *Bibliothèque Populaire*, also at two sous, consists of selections from French and foreign literature. The texts are very accurately printed, the translations are good, and the publishers are strict in the exclusion of immoral works; yet the sale of the collection is extensive, and it is found in the dwellings of the humbler classes. The same may be said of the *Bibliothèque Utile*, published by Alcan. But perhaps the best evidence on this subject is in the popular lending libraries instituted by the Government. The books for these libraries are specially examined by a commission appointed for the purpose, which excludes indecent publications. There are also the *bibliothèques scolaires* or lending libraries in the schools, and regimental libraries in the barracks, besides the older town libraries, often ex-

Horrible Situations.

*Cent Bons Livres.*

*La Bibliothèque Populaire.*

*La Bibliothèque Utile.*

Lending Libraries.

In Schools and Barracks.

tensive and valuable, which are open to all. With regard to the providing of literature in a form suitable for readers of limited education, I may add that this class of literature, simple in expression, yet neither deficient in intelligence nor behind the age in knowledge, scarcely existed in France twenty-five years ago, but is now produced in constantly increasing quantity. Even in former times, however, when facilities were so few, men of the humbler classes frequently rose in the world, and they could not have done that without self-education, nor without better reading than the "obscenity" of the *Saturday Review*. I have known several such Frenchmen, and have always found their minds preoccupied with creditable pursuits, generally of a scientific character.*

Recent Progress.

Self-made Frenchmen.

The wild statements of anonymous and irresponsible writers are hardly deserving of serious attention, but I have always deeply regretted that several English writers of note, and especially Matthew Arnold, should have allowed their patriotism to express itself in similar accusations. In 1885 Arnold wrote an article on America for the *Nineteenth Century*, and went out of his way to say that "the French" are "at

Matthew Arnold.

* A Natural History Society was founded in Autun (a small old town in Burgundy) two or three years ago. It now includes more than four hundred members. Their principal pleasure is to take long walks in the neighbourhood for geological and botanical purposes. They have meetings, lectures, and a museum. Anything more moral or more healthy it is impossible to imagine.

present vowed to the worship of the great goddess Lubricity." The Great Goddess Lubricity.

This is one of those statements about France which obtain ready currency in England, because they gratify the patriotic desire to feel better than the neighbours across the water. The ordinary Englishman, learning on the authority of a distinguished writer that the French are vowed to the worship of such a goddess, can think to himself, "Well, we have our faults, perhaps we worship money too much, but at any rate we do not bow down to such a filthy idol as that," and he has a sense of inward satisfaction. I, for my part, have never understood how anybody can derive satisfaction from anything but well-tested truth, and when I hear a comprehensive statement of this kind, my way is always to think of living examples known to me. I invite the reader to follow me, from a settled conviction that my method is a good one. English Satisfaction in French Immorality. Examples.

Have I ever known any Frenchman of whom it could be fairly said that he was vowed to the worship of the great goddess Lubricity? Yes, I have known one absolutely given over to that vice. His life had been that of a Sultan entirely absorbed in the pleasures of the harem; he was rich, idle, "noble," with no pursuits but that, and nature paid him with a terrible penalty. In his premature old age he would cynically boast of the exploits of that which, for his bestial nature, had been a sort of manhood. I have known a similar case in England, a man of some rank, whose whole mind centred itself on that one Two Extreme Cases of Vicious Lives.

pleasure, till at length it led him to conduct of such a character as to involve utter social ruin. Applied to these men Mr. Arnold's expression would be absolutely just.

Rarity of the Sexual Monomania.

But this state of mind, which amounts to a species of insanity or monomania, is rare. Men have other interests and pursuits. Those of the middle class have business, those of the upper have field sports, horses, yachting, travelling. A few have special studies, in France generally archæology, natural history, music, or painting. Are they all strictly virtuous in France? No. Are they all strictly virtuous in England? No. It is often suspected that when a young Englishman goes to town he yields to certain temptations, and when a provincial Frenchman *va à Paris pour s'amuser,* his friends imagine very frequently that he is tired of the strict surveillance of public opinion in the country. That rural public opinion is almost as strict in France as in England. A rich lady near a provincial town that I know committed adultery many years ago, and has been living in forced retirement ever since. Another rich lady in another provincial town, very beautiful, very charming, had a romantic adventure, and she, too, has been left alone in her great house. A wealthy young man brought a mistress down from Paris; she had not been out three times in her little pony carriage before it became a public scandal. In a similar neighbourhood in England it was perfectly well known that some of the rich young men had mistresses at a distance, but they could not bring them

Strictness of French Provincial Opinion.

Social Penalties.

Kept Mistresses in Provincial England and France.

near to their own homes for fear of the same scandal. I remember asking a French gentleman if he received a clever young man who had rendered services to his political party. "No," he said, "he is immoral, and I have a fixed rule never to receive immoral men."

Zola's Picture of Rural Life.

Whilst writing this chapter I have got a letter from a well-known Englishman who asks me if Zola's picture of rustic morals in *La Terre* is true. I have never read any of Zola's novels, preferring the study of life in nature, but I am told that the book is disgusting. In that case it cannot be true as a general representation of nature. I have lived in the country in Lancashire and Yorkshire, and in the French department of Saône-et-Loire, and so far as my observation has extended I should say that rustic morals are very nearly on the same level in both places. Cases of adultery are rare in both though not unknown. Illegitimate births occur occasionally in both. Our servants have conducted themselves as well in France as in England, and as well in England as in France. There have been a very few mishaps. It is not uncommon in the north of England for a child to be born too soon after marriage, and the same thing occurs in Saône-et-Loire. The daughters of the better class of farmers are, so far as I know, a most respectable class both in England and France. Some of the best quiet manners I have met with have been in that class—modest and simple manners without any pretension, but with dignity and self-respect.

Lancashire and Yorkshire.

Saône-et-Loire.

A Comparison.

Parallel Examples amongst Country Gentlefolks.

For the country gentlefolks here are parallel examples. I had a neighbour in England who lived quietly in the country, had certain rather refined tastes, and was respected by every one. I have a neighbour in France who lives quietly in the country, has precisely the same tastes as the Englishman, and lives with his family exactly in the same way, except perhaps, that he has *déjeuner* at eleven when the Englishman had luncheon at one. The Frenchman and his wife are also respected by everybody, and I have not the faintest reason for supposing that they do not deserve it. Yet I am asked to believe that they are intensely vicious, and if I inquire for proofs I am referred to novels written by some Parisian who has never seen my neighbours.

Unmarried Girls.

A large class, both in France and England, whose general good conduct is doubted by nobody who knows the countries, is that of unmarried girls in the middle and upper classes. Here a fall is so rare as to be practically unknown. The English girl is less retiring than the French *jeune fille*, and she knows more, but she is equally safe. It is something that the two civilisations should have produced at least one class that is so very nearly immaculate.

The French Clergy.

There are a few flagrant cases of immorality every year amongst the French clergy; but although surrounded by enemies eager to publish every fault, and powerless now to impose or procure silence, they keep, on the whole, a reputation equal to that of the Catholic clergy anywhere. Even their enemies believe them to be far more moral than the Italian

priesthood, for example. The clergy in England have an equally good reputation in spite of occasional scandals, and there is no reason for supposing it to be undeserved; but they have the safeguard of marriage. The Anglican Clergy.

With the armies the case is different. Soldiers and sailors enjoy a reputation for bravery, but not for sexual morality in either country. There is terribly strong medical evidence on the subject which I cannot go into, *real* evidence, better than the inventions of novelists. English medical opinions are of the gravest possible import, as they point to a danger to the military strength of the Country in comparison with which the Channel tunnel would be a trifle; but it may be argued, as regards the health of the nation generally, that the English army is but a part of the nation, whereas the French army represents the nation itself. Another difficulty in the comparison arises from the fact that, although the French may be quite as immoral as the English, their sanitary legislation is more rigorously prudent, so that the consequent physical evils are much diminished. This subject is almost forbidden me in a book intended for general reading; but if any one cares to form a just opinion, I recommend him to study authentic statistics of the health of armies. Soldiers and Sailors. English Medical Opinion. French Sanitary Legislation.

English student life is, on the whole, quieter and more moral than French. France has plenty of public schools in the country, or at least in country towns, where the boys are kept under the most rigorous restraint; but she has no country universities, she has Student Life in the Two Nations.

no Oxford and Cambridge, where young men live under a sort of gentle restraint, and in places of comparatively small size, where the army of vice is not in full force, but represented only by a detachment. French student life is chiefly concentrated in Paris, and resembles that of medical students and art students in London, which may, of course, be perfectly moral if they choose to make it so, but which, in the midst of innumerable facilities and temptations, depends entirely upon themselves.

Student Life in Capital Cities.

Student life in Edinburgh has the same liberty as in Paris, but is probably more moral on account of the greater seriousness of the Scottish character, and the intellectual ambition of Scottish youth. Both in England and France the errors of young men are very lightly passed over and excused; but in France they are more *expected*, more taken as a matter of course, and there is more of a settled tradition of immorality amongst French students than amongst English. Still, there is nothing in the French system to prevent a young man from living like a good Scotchman if he likes. Foreigners know nothing

Struggling Students in Paris.

about the struggling student who is at Paris for his work and has neither time nor money for much else. The reader is probably aware that amongst Scottish students there are striking examples of courage and self-denial, but he is not likely to know that Paris abounds with instances that, for a richer country,

Two Cases of French Students.

are precisely of the same kind. I will mention two cases, those of young men whom I know personally and regard with all the respect which they deserve.

One of them, in consequence of a family misfortune, was dependent upon his mother's labour, and by hard work and close economy she was able to support him when at school. She could not undertake the expense of his student life at Paris, but she had a relation there who offered two great helps, a bed and one meal every day. This was absolutely all the young man had to count upon; the rest had to be won by his own labour. He contrived—I have not space to tell how—to earn all the money necessary for everything else, and became an army surgeon, after which, by further hard work, he gained the medical *agrégation* (a sort of fellowship won by a severe medical examination). I know from his companions that during his student days he carefully kept aloof from idle and dissipated society. The other case is that of a young man whose mother, a widow, could do nothing for him. His earlier education was paid for by the bounty of a rich lady, but as soon as he could earn money by teaching he did so, and went on vigorously with his studies at the same time. He even managed to keep his mother by his labour without hindering his own advancement. He won a fellowship, and is now occupying the chair of a professor of history—I do not mean in a school, but as a *professeur de faculté*. He is one of the most cultivated men I ever knew, and probably one of the happiest. Such a career as his is not the usual consequence of a frivolous and dissipated youth. I was talking, an hour before writing this page, with a Frenchman whose own life has

Poor Students in Paris.

been a remarkable example of labour and self-denial, and he told me that there are at this moment hundreds of students in Paris who are supporting themselves, at least in part, by means of lessons and humble literary work, in order that they may enter the professions.

Efforts of poor Students for their own Support.

One or two indications have reached me which seem to imply that in England there exists a belief that French school life is immoral. This may be founded on the mutual amenities of the clerical and lay parties in France, which profess a complete disbelief in each other's morality, and would equally accuse each other of murder, if that were as difficult to test. Nobody knows much about the morality of boys, but I may observe that the government of French schools, both lay and clerical, is too strict for any immorality that can be detected to make way there. The very few instances of it in school life that have come to my knowledge have been followed by instant expulsion. I have heard something about school immorality in England, especially in one great public school, coupled with an expression of the desire that the rigorous French system could be established there, not in all things, but for this one safeguard.

French School Life.

Morality of Boys in French Schools.

Morality in English Schools.

With regard to the class of domestic servants, I am told that in Paris the morality of servants is generally much lower than in the country; but never having kept house in Paris I know nothing about it, except by hearsay. Statistics show a remarkably large proportion of illegitimate births for the capital;

Domestic Servants in Paris.

this, however, is rather favourable in a certain sense, I mean in the sense of natural morality, as the worst women are sterile. An ecclesiastic of high rank, who has had exceptional opportunities for studying the moral aspects of Paris told me that he attributed the greater laxity there in the class of domestics to the system of lodging, by which the servants are often separated from the family life of the household, and sent to sleep up in the attics, where they are in a world of their own.

The Parisian System of Lodging.

Here I leave this subject, the most difficult to treat in the volume, and the most unsatisfactory in many ways. It is unsatisfactory because the facts are usually concealed, and that leaves room for uncharitable minds to assume a concealed immorality in others, as, for example, when it is assumed, without any proof, that respectable French people are immoral. It is unsatisfactory, because there are two codes of morality, a severe one that is expressed, and a laxer one that is understood and acted upon. It is unsatisfactory, because language itself is so employed as to make the same actions pure or impure as they are or are not admitted by the customs of society. But the subject is most unsatisfactory because there is a permanent conflict between the animal nature of man and the situation in which a safe and peaceful civilisation places him. He is gifted with reproductive powers well adapted to fill up the ranks of primitive societies as they were continually decimated by disease, by famine, and by

Unsatisfactory Nature of the Subject.

Two Codes of Morality.

Permanent Conflict between Man's Animal Nature and his civilised Condition.

violent death; but in a state of civilisation in which diseased people live on, in which famine is all but unknown, and wars continually postponed, the reproductive force is so much in excess of the need for it that it bursts forth in tremendous moral evils. Nor is the difficulty lessening; it is, on the contrary, increasing year by year. The prudent classes avoid marriage more and more, thus exposing young men to the snare of the kept mistress or the peril of promiscuous concubinage. The imprudent classes marry with perfect recklessness, and even their marriages themselves are indirectly favourable to immorality, because they supply recruits for the army of vice by bringing up children in conditions that make decency impossible. The crowding of people together in industrial centres and the craving for town excitements all tend towards the one greatest and most natural of all excitements; the vast increase of military life tends to it also in other ways. But of all the influences directly or indirectly tending towards immorality *Gentility* is the most subtle and deadly in its operation. Genteel young men dare not marry on small incomes because poverty will take the polish off their style of living; genteel young ladies cannot marry unless they are assured of incomes large enough to dress fashionably and have all the housework done by servants. In France, and not in France only, but much more in France than in England, the number of offspring is limited that the family may maintain a genteel position in life and not fall down into the working classes. In the poorer

Increase of the Difficulty.

The Prudent Classes avoid Marriage.

The Imprudent.

Effects of Crowding.

Gentility.

Limitation of Offspring.

classes themselves the desire for a genteel appearance is the great temptation of women. I remember a dangerously beautiful young Frenchwoman married to a professional man who earned a wretchedly small income, yet she dressed most expensively, and had but one means of paying her milliner's bills. She was the representative of a class. When we look these truths and their consequences in the face, we come to understand the close connection that there is between natural morality and simplicity of life. It is of no use to preach morality to people so long as we show by our language, by our manners, by every kind of expression or implication, that we despise them for living plainly and respect them for living luxuriously. By the help of the tailor, the cook, and the carriage-builder I can be a "gentleman" in England, and a *"monsieur comme il faut"* in France; by the help of Epictetus I can live simply and be a common man whom the luxurious man will patronise.

The great Temptation of Women.

Connection between Morality and plain Living.

Luxurious Livers respected.

This chapter has been occupied more with actions than with ideals, but it would not be complete without some reference to ideals. The English idea takes the form of moral pride, of belief in one's own moral superiority. This is offensive to other nations because it expresses iself unpleasantly, not in words only but in manners. But however offensive it may be to Frenchmen (and it irritates them to the supreme degree), it is most valuable to the English themselves as a strength and a support. The intense soldierly pride of the military caste in Prussia was offensive,

The English Idea.

Utility of English Moral Pride.

but it enabled the army to endure the discipline that led to all success. No amount of divorce-court evidence, no amount of medical evidence, no amount of ocular evidence, even in the public streets, will ever convince the English that they are not moral, and therefore their moral standard is maintained, at least ideally. It is well for them to have this opinion about themselves so long as they make the feeblest effort to justify it. To have national pride on the side of morality is to give morality a mighty ally.

Want of moral Pride in France.

The French, unfortunately for them, have never associated national pride with morality. They have associated it with generosity, with courage, and with the externals of civilisation, but never with sexual purity. The French never think that they are purer than other people, they imagine that the weakness of humanity is the same everywhere, and as Paris is the pleasure city of Europe they have ample opportunities for observing how foreigners conduct themselves there, which only confirms them in their opinion. Still, it cannot be truly said that the entire French nation is without an ideal, even in this matter. The goddess of French maidenhood is not the goddess of Lubricity, but her precise opposite, the Holy Virgin. It has been written, with slight exaggeration, that every French girl is called Marie; it is not an exaggeration to say that every French girl brought up in the Catholic religion is taught to look to the Holy Virgin as her ideal. It may be answered that the Virgin Mary is not unknown in England either; certainly the Virgin Mary is known

Foreigners in Paris.

The Goddess of French Maidenhood.

The Virgin Mary and

there, but *La Sainte Vierge* is not. The Virgin Mary is partly ideal, but there is much everyday reality about her, and Protestantism insists upon that reality which French Catholicism conceals. The Virgin Mary is also an ordinary mother; she had a family by Joseph, the carpenter. In *La Sainte Vierge* there is nothing to diminish the purity of the ideal; her marriage with Joseph was merely nominal, and Joseph himself was a great saint above the common lot of humanity. *La Sainte Vierge* had but one child, and that one by the mysterious operation of the Holy Spirit. The Virgin Mary is in heaven, *La Sainte Vierge* reigns for ever as the crowned Queen of Heaven and the royal patroness and special protectress of France. Her statue is on a hundred hills, it looks down benignantly from a thousand towers, she herself, the mystical Tower of Ivory, has preserved many a French city from invasion. Every French girl, at her *première communion*, is robed in white from head to foot in emulation of her purity; during *her* month, *le mois de Marie*, her hundred thousand altars are covered with flowers in memory of her sweetness, and all the terms of love and praise are exhausted in her litanies.

*La Sainte Vierge.*

*La Sainte Vierge* an Ideal.

The Queen of Heaven.

There is no ideal for the male sex comparable to this. We have read of Sir Galahad who could say—

Want of a Masculine moral Ideal.

"I never felt the kiss of love,
Nor maiden's hand in mine."

But who is Sir Galahad? In England only a poetical creation, in France unheard of and unknown. Were he known he would encounter a danger that

Sir Galahad.

even the bravest knight might dread. It might be decided, in France, that he was ridiculous. I have been represented as holding the opinion that France and England are exactly on the same level in morals; but that is not my view. Justice consists in giving everybody his due, it does not consist in believing that nations are exactly alike. I have no doubt that England is the more moral country of the two, even in practice, and much more in principle and feeling. The great difference (and it is most profound) is that the English are still capable of stern and austere feeling about these matters, which they have derived from Puritan ancestors; whereas the French, even when practically chaste in their own lives, regard adultery, in the male sex at least, with a sort of amusement not always unmingled with admiration for the address and audacity of the sinner. A witty word may save him. I knew a marble-cutter who was accused of some illicit passion, and who saved himself by the reply, *"Pour être marbrier, on n'est pas de marbre."* A certain incident in the life of a former prime minister of Egypt may be taken as a test of the feeling of the two countries. In England he is looked upon with serious respect as an example of chastity in youth, and wisdom in maturity; but in France all the ability of his administration cannot efface the recollection of his *"niaiserie"* in the well-known interview with "Madame Putiphar," and shame-faced youths are called after him to this day.

England the more moral Country. Especially in Principle and Feeling.

The Story of Joseph.

PRINTING OFFICE OF THE PUBLISHER.